THE UNCHANGEABLE CHURCH

VOLUME II

THE ANNUNCIATION

FROM THE PAINTING BY GENTILESCHI

"Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it done unto me according to thy word."

THE
UNCHANGEABLE CHURCH

HER HEROES, HER MARTYRS
HER TRIALS, AND HER TRIUMPHS

WITH INTRODUCTION BY

VERY REV. MGR. EDWARD J. McGOLRICK
PASTOR OF ST. CECILIA'S CHURCH, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

IN TWO VOLUMES
CONTAINING EIGHT BOOKS

VOLUME II

With Pictures from the Great Painters

"And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. . . . Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."—MATT. xvi. 18; xxviii. 20.

NEW YORK
JOHN DUFFY, PUBLISHER
757 BROADWAY
1910

Copyright, 1907, 1908, by John Duffy

THE TROW PRESS · NEW YORK

CONTENTS

BOOK V

WHY AMERICA SHOULD BE CATHOLIC

CHAPTER XXII

THE CHURCH IN THE NEW WORLD—WHY AMERICA SHOULD BE CATHOLIC

PAGE

A continuous record of heroic personages and beneficent achievements—Christopher Columbus, the great Catholic navigator—The mystery of the western seas—Repeated failures to secure support—Columbus at the monastery of La Rabida—Father Juan Perez de Marchena secures for Columbus the aid of Queen Isabella—The good priest also interests the brothers Pinzon in the cause—Beginning of the greatest voyage in the history of the world—Land sighted—The discoverers, kneeling upon the shore, give thanks to God—Columbus showered with honors on his return to Spain—The great navigator makes three subsequent voyages—His death—The glory of the discovery of America belongs to Columbus and to the Catholic Church—First prayers to Almighty God in the New World offered up by Catholic priests—England while still Catholic enters the field of American discovery—John and Sebastian Cabot—Celebration of Holy Mass for the earliest congregation assembled in America—The Catholic explorers Cartier and Champlain—Other Catholic discoverers—Beginning of the Hierarchy of the United States—America an early asylum for persecuted English Catholics—Sir George Calvert, afterward Lord Baltimore, a Catholic convert—His son, Cecilius, second Lord Baltimore—Maryland—Catholic missionaries—Their incessant labor and many hardships—Conversion of Protestants—Puritans received with hospitality—They prove ungrateful—Testimony of American historians concerning civil and religious liberty in Maryland—Protestant intolerance—Revolt of the American colonies against England—Catholics in the Revolution—Sentiment of the American people regarding their Catholic fellow-countrymen undergoes a decided change—Address of the American Catholic clergy and laity to President Washington—The illustrious man's reply—The American Hierarchy—Catholic institutions in the United States 393

BOOK VI

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

CHAPTER XXIII

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

PAGE

The truth of God, announced in the name of his holy Church—Education one of the most important questions of the day—Essential to the well-being of society—The curse of utter ignorance—Intelligence the highest portion of the soul of man—Human society based upon intellectual communication—Menace of the uneducated—The Catholic Church, true mother of souls, demands education—Faith in God its foundation—Definition of faith—The Church imposes duties that require a highly trained and well-educated intellect—Prayer and the sacraments as intellectual aids—Self-interest the world's appeal—The Church's, not self, but charity—Her revelation of spiritual beauties—Singular delusion of Protestants—Their blind complacency—Education in Rome—Catholic schools—Work of the Christian Brothers and the Nuns—Educating the children of the poor—The utterly ignorant man an enemy of the Church—Illiterate Protestants rarely converted—Great conversions among the most highly educated and cultivated persons—The Catholic Church the true fountainhead and source of education—The truth personified—Three systems of education in America—Teaching without God—Perfection unattainable without the aid of Jesus Christ—The Christian's chief purpose in life—God in the very first passage of history—Philosophy begins in God—Human science, in its ultimate analysis, falls back upon the First Truth: God—Uneducated educators—The child is father to the man—Moral training as essential as mental—An intellectual monster—Trying to put God in the American Constitution—A Protestant school conducted on Protestant principles—The Divinity of Jesus Christ denied by many Protestant clergymen—Catholic schools first in educational work—St. Paul's words on education without God—The Catholic system develops the child's soul and mind—"Suffer children to come to Me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God" 437

CHAPTER XXIV

CATHOLICITY NOT THE DANGER, BUT THE SAFETY OF THE GREAT AMERICAN REPUBLIC

The American nation yet in its youth—Its amazing material and intellectual growth—Great questions not yet decided—Religion the vital principle of the people's life—America looking

PAGE

for the truth—Bound to become Catholic—Strength in unity—Patriotism, or love of country—Religious union—What it stands for—The immutable principle of eternal responsibility—Evils of manifold forms of religious worship—The principles of Catholicity—The Church's divine commission and guarantee—Jesus Christ in the Blessed Eucharist—Political freedom and religious unity of Catholics—Failure of the religion of private judgment—*Ego sum lux mundi!* ("I am the light of the world!")—The principle of disunion in Protestantism—Revealed truth often transcends the human mind—From religious disunion spring social and political dissensions—Historical truths of the Catholic Church—Her great work in behalf of morality and good citizenship—The inviolable sanctity of the marriage-tie—How the Church protects the wife—No Catholic can separate a mother from her children—Divorce rending modern society, as Samson rent the temple of the Philistines—The Catholic Church alone upholds the falling edifice—Protector of the home—Future of America must be Catholic—No slavery in Catholicity—To accept the truth and be incapable of contradicting it is the supremacy of liberty—"You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"—Difference between Catholicity and Protestantism illustrated—The Catholic faith the highest form of intellectual freedom—The Catholic priesthood—"Blessed are the poor in spirit"—The Catholic Church the stanch friend of republics—Her appeal is always to the people—The great, generous heart of America—The crowning grace of unity of faith and sacramental sanctity—Ancient despotisms will do homage to magnificent Columbia 457

CHAPTER XXV

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS—EDUCATION OF THE CLERGY—CHRISTIAN EDUCATION—GOOD READING—THE CATHOLIC PRESS

The earliest Christian school—"Imperial schools"—Reading of pagan authors forbidden by St. Jerome—Monasteries as training schools—Europe invaded by the barbarians—Survival of episcopal and monastic schools—Institutions of learning in Ireland—Suppression of the schools of Athens—Influence of St. Benedict upon Western Europe—Education under Charlemagne—The Normans as propagators of learning—Lanfranc and St. Anselm—Beginning of modern universities at Paris—William of Wykeham—The public schools of England—Venerable De la Salle, founder of the Christian Brothers—Repressive legislation in England—Academies and colleges of the Jesuit fathers—Public schools of the United States—Catholic parochial schools—Education of the clergy—Of the laity—Good reading—The Catholic press 478

CHAPTER XXVI

FATHERS AND COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH 494

CHAPTER XXVII

THE WONDERFUL LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI

PAGE

Birth of the saint—His father and mother—Worldly pursuits of the young Francis—His charity —Visions of Francis—Persecutions and humiliations—Francis begins a new life—Consoles and tends the leprous—Assists in repairing the church of St. Peter Damian—Restores other churches—Draws men to repentance—His disciples—Francis composes the rule of his order—Sets out for Rome—Unfavorably received by Innocent III—The Pope's vision—He receives and embraces Francis—Approves the rule—The saint returns to Assisi—His vision—Francis sends forth his disciples—St. Clare, foundress of the Order of Poor Clares —Multitudes flock to St. Francis—Another vision—The saint goes to Perugia—Interview with Honorius III—Temptation of St. Francis—Indulgence of Portiuncula—The saint's love for all God's creatures—The wolf of Gubbio—Francis journeys to the Holy Land —His interview with the Sultan—The saint's supreme love for the Church and the Blessed Sacrament—His meditations on the Passion—The Sacred Stigmata—Devotion of St. Francis to the Blessed Virgin—His death 498

BOOK VII

CATHOLIC TRUTH *VERSUS* PROTESTANT ERROR

CHAPTER XXVIII

CARDINAL MANNING, CONVERT TO THE FAITH, ON THE CHURCH'S INFALLIBILITY

Infallibility promised by Christ to his Church—The means promised by our Divine Lord to render his Church infallible—The faith of the ancient Church relating to the matter—The distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals examined—The first part of the distinction renders the reformers and their respective churches inexcusable—The second part of the distinction contradicts the Word of God—It gives the lie to the Nicene Creed—It destroys all certainty in matters of faith—It renders all church authority precarious—The Church in communion with the see of Rome has alone a just title to infallibility 529

CHAPTER XXIX

THE CHURCH OF ROME VINDICATED

PAGE

The state of religion in Christendom before the pretended reformation—The antiquity of the doctrine called Popery proved from Protestant writers—No Christian church teaching a doctrine opposite to Popery ever appeared in the world before it—Objections answered—The adviser's system concerning the first establishment of Popery—The capital reformer had no ordinary mission—Neither had he an extraordinary mission—Luther's doctrine concerning free-will, repentance, and good works—His doctrine concerning the legislative power—Luther no slave to truth—Declaration of the Duchess of York concerning the occasion and motives of her conversion 585

CHAPTER XXX

SOME FEW OF THE MANY REASONS WHICH MUST FOREVER ATTACH A ROMAN CATHOLIC TO HIS RELIGION 650

BOOK VIII

MASS AND THE SACRAMENTS

CHAPTER XXXI

THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

Sacrifice offered from of old to God alone—The Mass prefigured in the Old Testament—The same sacrifice as that of the Cross—Foretold by the Prophet Malachias (Malachi)—Frequency of celebration—Hour of Mass—Application of the Holy Sacrifice—High and Low Mass—Missa cantata; publica; privata; parochialis—Capitular, Conventual, and Votive Masses—Missa adventitia—Mass of the Presanctified—The Passion and death of Jesus in the Mass—"The Hidden Treasure of the Holy Mass"—The Eucharist—Instituted by Christ himself—The real presence—Transubstantiation—Mode of Christ's presence—Ministration and effects of the Eucharist—The Eucharist as a sacrifice—Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament 673

CHAPTER XXXII

PAGE

THE SACRAMENTS 738

CHAPTER XXXIII

MARRIAGE—KEYSTONE OF THE SOCIAL FABRIC

Christian marriage the basis of the Christian home—Indissolubility of the marriage-tie—Nature of marriage—As defined by the Master of Sentences—Evils of polygamy—Marriage as a sacrament—So defined by the Council of Trent—As viewed by St. Cyril, St. Augustine, and St. Paul—The perfect antitype of Christ's union with his Church—St. Ambrose on the sanctity of the marriage bond—Sacramental grace conferred—Marriage a sacrament instituted by Christ—View of Melchior Cano adopted by other theologians and scholars—Opinion of Tertullian—Allocution of Pius IX—Validity of marriage—The Church on divorce—The law of Israel on the subject—Rabbinical disputes—Divorce in Athens and in Rome under the empire—Pharisaic immorality condemned, and the Mosaic dispensation annulled, by our Lord—Catholic view of the marriage bond—Divorce as dealt with by Christian princes—As viewed by the fathers—Erroneous views of Lutherans and Calvinists—Unity of marriage—The banns—Ceremonies of marriage—The Church on mixed marriages 813

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FACING PAGE

THE CALL OF JESUS . . . . . *Frontispiece*
From the painting by L. Crosio.

LANDING OF COLUMBUS IN THE NEW WORLD 396
From the painting by Alonzo Chappel.

"OF SUCH IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN" 454
From the painting by Benjamin West, R. A.

THE PENNY OF CÆSAR 468
From the painting by Valentin.

THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL IN SESSION 484
Baltimore, December, 1884.

ECSTASY OF ST. FRANCIS 504
From the painting by Philippe Lauri.

THE SACRED STIGMATA OF ST. FRANCIS 520
From the painting by Laurent de Lahire.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN 538
From the painting by Rembrandt.

JESUS IN THE HOME OF MARTHA AND MARY 580
From the painting by H. Van Steinwick the younger.

THE FIVE HOLY ONES 608
From the painting by Raphael.

RAPTURE OF ST. PAUL 637
From the painting by Domenichino.

THE WOMAN OF CANAAN 657
From the painting by Drouais.

THE LAST SUPPER 675
From the painting by Philippe Champagne.

FACING PAGE

JESUS AND THE SAMARITAN WOMAN 732
From the painting by Guido Reni.

ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST 746
From the painting by Guido Reni.

THE DESCENT FROM THE CROSS 756
From the celebrated painting by Rubens, in Antwerp Cathedral, Belgium.

THE BODY OF JESUS RESTING IN THE LAP OF HIS MOTHER . . . 764
From the painting by Sir Anthony Van Dyck.

THE DISCIPLES AT EMMAUS 772
From the famous painting by Rembrandt.

INCREDULITY OF ST. THOMAS 784
From the painting by Rubens.

THE HOLY FAMILY 814
From the painting by Jules Romain.

BOOK V

WHY AMERICA SHOULD BE CATHOLIC

THE UNCHANGEABLE CHURCH

CHAPTER XXII

THE CHURCH IN THE NEW WORLD—WHY AMERICA SHOULD BE CATHOLIC

A continuous record of heroic personages and beneficent achievements—Christopher Columbus, the great Catholic navigator—The mystery of the western seas—Repeated failures to secure support—Columbus at the monastery of La Rabida—Father Juan Perez de Marchena secures for Columbus the aid of Queen Isabella—The good priest also interests the brothers Pinzon in the cause—Beginning of the greatest voyage in the history of the world—Land sighted—The discoverers, kneeling upon the shore, give thanks to God—Columbus showered with honors on his return to Spain—The great navigator makes three subsequent voyages—His death—The glory of the discovery of America belongs to Columbus and to the Catholic Church—First prayers to Almighty God in the New World offered up by Catholic priests—England while still Catholic enters the field of American discovery—John and Sebastian Cabot—Celebration of Holy Mass for the earliest congregation assembled in America—The Catholic explorers Cartier and Champlain—Other Catholic discoverers—Beginning of the Hierarchy of the United States—America an early asylum for persecuted English Catholics—Sir George Calvert, afterward Lord Baltimore, a Catholic convert—His son, Cecilius, second Lord Baltimore—Maryland—Catholic missionaries—Their incessant labor and many hardships—Conversion of Protestants—Puritans received with hospitality—They prove ungrateful—Testimony of American historians concerning civil and religious liberty in Maryland—Protestant intolerance—Revolt of the American colonies against England—Catholics in the Revolution—Sentiment of the American people regarding their Catholic fellow-countrymen undergoes a decided change—Address of the American Catholic clergy and laity to President Washington—The illustrious man's reply—The American Hierarchy—Catholic institutions in the United States.

THE history of the Catholic Church in America, from the time of the discovery of the New World by the great Catholic navigator, Christopher Columbus, is a continuous record of heroic personages and beneficent achievements. Of these it is our purpose to mention, in the narrow compass of this chapter, only a few glorious names which may serve as starting-points for Catholic readers, and especially for Catholic youth, in the study of the literature of their holy religion; and in beginning this unpre-

tentious recital, the immortal name of the Catholic admiral and discoverer of our beloved country naturally and fittingly suggests itself.

Christopher Columbus was born at Genoa in 1435 or 1436. His father was a wool-comber of some small means. Columbus was sent to the University of Pavia, where he devoted himself to the mathematical and natural sciences, and where he probably received instruction in nautical astronomy. On his removal from the university, it appears that he worked for some months at his father's trade; but on reaching his fifteenth year he made his choice of life, and became a sailor.

The earlier years of the future discoverer's life, like the later, were stormy, laborious, and eventful. "Wherever ship has sailed," he writes, "there have I journeyed." He is known, among other places, to have visited England, Iceland ("Ultima Thule"), the Guinea coast, and the Greek isles; and he appears to have been some time in the service of René of Provence, for whom he is recorded to have intercepted and seized a Venetian galley with great bravery and audacity. According to his son and biographer, Fernando, he sailed with Colombo el Mozo, a bold sea captain; and a sea fight under this commander was the means of bringing him ashore in Portugal.

Meanwhile, however, Columbus was preparing himself for greater achievements by reading and meditating on the works of Ptolemy and Marinus, of Nearchus and Pliny, the "Cosmographia" of Cardinal Aliaco, the travels of Marco Polo and Mandeville. He mastered all the sciences essential to his calling, learned to draw charts and construct spheres, and thus fitted himself to become a consummate practical seaman and navigator.

In 1470 he arrived at Lisbon, after being wrecked in a sea fight that began off Cape St. Vincent, and escaping to land on a plank. In Portugal he married the daughter of a captain in the service of Prince Henry, called the Navigator, one of the early colonists and the first governor of Porto Santo, an island off Madeira. Columbus visited the island, and employed his time in

making maps and charts for a livelihood, while he pored over the logs and papers of his deceased father-in-law, and talked with old seamen of their voyages, and of the mystery of the western seas. About this time, too, he seems to have arrived at the conclusion that much of the world remained undiscovered, and step by step to have conceived that design of reaching Asia by sailing west which was to result in the discovery of America.

But the concurrence of some state or sovereign was necessary for the success of this design. After repeated failures to secure this support, Columbus, reduced to despair, betook himself to Huelva, with the intention of taking ship for France. He halted, however, at Palos, a little maritime town in Andalusia. At the monastery of La Rabida he knocked and asked for bread and water for his boy Diego, and presently got into conversation with Juan Perez de Marchena, the guardian, who invited him to take up his quarters in the monastery, and introduced him to Garci Fernandez, a physician and an ardent student of geography. To these good men Columbus explained his plan. The pious Juan Perez had been Queen Isabella's confessor; he wrote to her, and was summoned to her presence; and money was sent to Columbus, to bring him to the court of their Catholic Majesties Ferdinand and Isabella. The great Queen at length determined on the expedition, and on April 17, 1492, an agreement between Columbus and their Catholic Majesties was signed and sealed.

The town of Palos was ordered to find him two ships, and these were soon placed at his disposal. But no crews could be got together; and had not the good Father Juan Perez succeeded in interesting Martin Alonso Pinzon and Vicente Yañez Pinzon in the cause, Columbus's departure would have been long delayed. At last, however, men, ships, and stores were ready. The expedition consisted of the *Santa Maria*, a decked ship, with a crew of fifty men, commanded by the great admiral in person; and of two caravels, the *Pinta*, with thirty men, under Martin Pinzon, and the *Niña*, with twenty-four men, under his brother Vicente Yañez. The hardy adventurers numbered one hundred and twenty souls;

and on Friday, August 3, 1492, at eight in the morning, the little fleet weighed anchor and stood out for the Canary Islands, and the greatest voyage in the history of the world was begun.

An abstract of the admiral's diary made by the holy Bishop Las Casas is extant, and from it many particulars may be gleaned concerning this first voyage. After various adventures and trials, on October 11 the *Pinta* fished up a cane, a log of wood, a stick wrought with iron, and a board, and the *Niña* sighted a stake covered with dog-roses; "and with these signs all of them breathed, and were glad." At ten o'clock on that night Columbus perceived and pointed out a light ahead; and at two in the morning of Friday, October 12, 1492, Rodrigo de Triana, a sailor aboard the *Niña*, announced the appearance of what proved to be the New World. The land sighted was an island.

The same morning Columbus landed, richly clad, and bearing the royal banner of Spain. He was accompanied by his captains, the brothers Pinzon, bearing banners of the Cross, and by great part of the crew. When they all had "given thanks to God, kneeling upon the shore, and kissed the ground with tears of joy, for the great mercy received," the admiral named the island San Salvador, after our Blessed Saviour, and solemnly took possession of it for their Catholic Majesties of Castile and Leon. At the same time such of the crews as had shown themselves doubtful and mutinous during the perilous expedition sought his pardon weeping, and prostrated themselves at his feet. This voyage also resulted in the discovery of other islands of the West Indies.

On the return of Columbus to Spain, the court was at Barcelona; and thither, after despatching a letter announcing his arrival, the discoverer proceeded in person. He entered the city in triumphal procession, was received by their Catholic Majesties in full court, and, seated in their presence, related the story of his voyage. All his honors and privileges were confirmed to him; the title of "Don" was conferred on himself and his brothers; he rode at the King's bridle; he was served and saluted as a grandee of Spain; and, greatest honor of all, a new and magnificent escutcheon was

LANDING OF COLUMBUS IN THE NEW WORLD

FROM THE PAINTING BY ALONZO CHAPPEL

"When they all had 'given thanks to God, kneeling upon the shore, and kissed the ground with tears of joy, for the great mercy received,' the admiral named the island San Salvador, after our Blessed Saviour, and solemnly took possession of it for their Catholic Majesties of Castile and Leon."

blazoned for him, whereon the royal castle and lion of Castile and Leon were combined with the four anchors of his own coat of arms.

The great navigator made three subsequent voyages, discovering various islands and founding colonies. On May 20, 1506, he died. He was buried at Valladolid; but his remains were soon after transferred thence to the Carthusian monastery of Las Cuevas, Seville, where the bones of Diego, the second admiral, were also laid. Exhumed in 1536, the bodies of both father and son were taken over sea to Hispaniola (San Domingo), and interred in the cathedral. In 1795–96, on the cession of that island to the French, the august relics were reëxhumed, and were transferred with great state and solemnity to the cathedral of Havana, where they yet remain.

In person Columbus was tall and shapely, long-faced and aquiline, light-eyed and auburn-haired, and beautifully complexioned. At thirty his hair was quite gray. He was temperate in eating, drinking, and dress; and "so strict in religious matters, that for fasting and saying all the divine office, he might be thought professed in some religious order." His piety, as his son has noted, was earnest and unwavering; it entered into and colored alike his action and his speech. He was preëminently fitted for the task he created for himself; through all obstacles and difficulties he pushed on toward the consummation of his desire; and when the hour for action came the man was not found wanting.

To Columbus and to the Catholic Church, then, belongs the deathless glory of the discovery of our beloved land—an achievement which, in its influence on the well-being of the human family in all succeeding ages, is absolutely unrivalled in importance in the history of the world; for if the good priest of La Rabida, Father Juan Perez, had not befriended and aided the great navigator in his extremity, all his plans would have come to naught. And the first prayers offered up to Almighty God on the threshold of the New World were uttered by priests of the Catholic Church. Scarcely had these brave and pious men touched dry land when they humbly prostrated themselves before the throne of the Father

of all, devoutly thanked him for his mercy and care in bringing them safely through the dangers of the unknown deep, and besought his blessing on the newly discovered country.

The great discovery of 1492 was followed by other voyages. In all cases zealous Catholic priests accompanied the expeditions, and by the ecclesiastical law the religious jurisdiction over these new and vast missions belonged to the European diocese from whose ports the respective expeditions sailed. England while still Catholic now entered the field of American discovery. Two English voyagers, John and Sebastian Cabot, father and son, sailing from the port of Bristol, navigated along and landed on the northern shores of our continent, beginning with 1497; and an English Catholic priest, within five years (1502), chanted Latin hymns and litanies, and offered the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, for the earliest English congregation assembled in America.

All subsequent English discoveries and colonies were conducted under the new or Protestant dispensation, without cross or priest or sacrifice, until the year 1634, when, under Lord Baltimore, with a body of English Catholic colonists, Catholicity, with civil and religious liberty, founded an altar and a civil constitution on the shores of St. Mary's River, in Maryland, source at once of our present Catholic Church organization and hierarchy, and model of the free and peerless Constitution of our country.

French explorers and apostles entered the field; Cartier in 1534, with Catholic priests and colonists, and Champlain in 1609, founded, at the north, what became New France; the Christian commonwealth extended from Quebec to Montreal, westward along our northern lakes, southward through the valley of the Mississippi to Louisiana and Texas: a vast empire, marked by a line of military posts and forts, sites of the first Catholic shrines, extending through a continent, and ennobled by the presence, the labors, and the sacrifices of a succession of Catholic missionaries, whose heroic lives and martyr deaths are worthy of the best ages of the Christian Church. Thus a vast continent and the western Church became allied to the ancient Church of France.

Florida, Texas, the Territories and States acquired by the United States from Mexico, extending from Texas to the Pacific and thence northward to the boundary between California and Oregon, were discovered, explored, and colonized by Catholic Spanish admirals, generals, and missionaries. Saintly priests accompanied the expeditions. A vast Christian empire was founded, acknowledging the temporal dominion of the King of Spain and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of our Holy Father the Pope.

English, French, and Spanish agencies and elements thus contributed to the early formation of the Catholic Church and hierarchy of the United States. But prior to, and at the time of, the origin of the American hierarchy by the appointment of Rev. Dr. John Carroll as first Bishop of Baltimore, with jurisdiction extending over the entire United States and the Territories, the English colonies, now free and independent States, had been and were under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the vicars apostolic of London, and from an English Catholic bishop Dr. Carroll received consecration. The London vicariate apostolic, which has grown to be the present archdiocese of Westminster, an ancient English see restored, was thus the parent of the first American diocese.

The United States having succeeded to the rights and possessions of England at the treaty of peace and recognition of our independence, the Church adjusted herself to the new situation, and Dr. Carroll, the patriarch of the American Church, went to England for his consecration. Like the mother country then, America became, and has remained to our day, a missionary land, governed, through the Congregation of the Propaganda,[1] by the See of Rome. Such was the origin of the present imposing hierarchy of the United States.

After the apostasy of England from the faith of Edward the Confessor, St. Anselm, St. Thomas of Canterbury, and Sir Thomas More, the yearning of English Catholics to escape the direful persecutions under which they suffered at home, developed into plans of American colonization, and resulted in founding here an asylum

[1] See "The Propaganda," Volume I, chapter iv, of this work.

for Catholics seeking civil and religious liberty. Thus the penal laws of England against Catholics became interwoven with the history of the Catholic Church in America.

Persecution at home became the fountain from which free institutions sprang up abroad, for the oppressed Catholics saw their only hope in endeavors to consecrate in America a sanctuary for the conscience. The efforts of Lord Baltimore were preceded by a brave attempt of two other Catholic knights—Sir George Peckham and Sir Thomas Gerard—to found a colony for Catholics at Nurembega, within Newfoundland as then defined, but which was, in fact, within the present limits of the State of Maine. The expedition sailed from England on June 11, 1583, under Sir Humphrey Gilbert; the port of St. John, Newfoundland, was entered, a landing effected, the country taken possession of in the name of the Queen of England, and thence they proceeded for Nurembega. But the expedition was overtaken by storm, and Sir Humphrey Gilbert and his brave companions perished at sea. The other vessels, with the survivors, finally reached England.

The next effort to found in America an asylum for persecuted English Catholics was made in 1605 by Winslade, who had served in the Spanish Armada. The expedition sailed on March 5, 1605; reached the American coast; made Cape Cod, which they called St. George's, where they planted a cross; landed at Booth Bay, which they called Pentecost Harbor, where another cross was erected; and ascended the Kennebec River. Lord Arundel was a patron of this undertaking, which included in its high purposes the evangelization of the Indians. The expedition was not successful; had it been otherwise, New England might have been Catholic instead of Puritan.

The next Catholic movement was made under Sir George Calvert, afterward Lord Baltimore. In 1620, before he became a Catholic, he purchased the southeast peninsula of Newfoundland, and sent out a colony under Captain Edward Wynne at Ferryland. In 1624 he announced his conversion to the Catholic faith, without forfeiting the friendship of King James I, who raised him to the

peerage under the title of Lord Baltimore, and gave him estates in Ireland. Calvert himself sailed for America in 1627, reaching Avalon, as it was then called, with colonists and supplies, and accompanied by two seminary priests—Fathers Longvill and Anthony Smith. The colonists were not all Catholics, but Lord Baltimore accorded freedom of worship to his Protestant colonists, who had the ministration of Rev. William Stourton. This ungrateful man, on his return to England, filed an information against Lord Baltimore for permitting Mass to be said in the very land where religious liberty was given to Stourton and his flock!

In 1628 Lord Baltimore came out again to Avalon, with most of his family, to remain there, and was accompanied by another priest—Father Hacket. Perfect freedom of conscience was granted by Lord Baltimore to all who took part in the colony of Avalon; and he, rising above the bigotry of his times, thus began in Newfoundland that sublime system of civil and religious liberty which his son Cecilius afterward so nobly perfected in Maryland. Finding the climate too severe, Lord Baltimore, with his family, sailed southward; and it was Lady Baltimore who, delighted with the country about Chesapeake Bay, urged her husband to select that region for his settlement. They visited Virginia in October, 1629; and although he was a member of the Virginia Company, he was repulsed from her shores by Governor Pott and an official named Claiborne (who afterward became his bitter opponent in Maryland), who demanded that he should take the oath of supremacy. One of the noblest Englishmen of his day was not prepared to betray the ancient faith of all Englishmen, to which he had just returned, and in which the enjoyment of a free conscience was worth to him exile and every danger, labor, and privation. Leaving his family in Virginia, Lord Baltimore returned to England.

He had already written from Avalon to King Charles I on August 19, 1629, petitioning for a grant of land in Virginia, and the enjoyment of the same privileges granted him in Newfoundland. On arriving home, Lord Arundel joined him in his application, and the charter for a colony and grant of land in Virginia

was bestowed; but, on the vehement protest of Claiborne and other Virginia officials, who saw ruin to themselves from a Catholic colony in their vicinity, the King was constrained to revoke it.

On the persevering request of Lord Baltimore, however, a grant of land was made to him to the northward on the Chesapeake, together with a charter for a colony, which was named Maryland, or *Terra Mariæ*, in compliment to Queen Henrietta Maria. The charter was a liberal one, and secured to the Lord Proprietary and the colonists legislative power of broad scope. Before the charter received the great seal, George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore, died, and his son, Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, succeeded to his estates, to his virtues, and to his statesmanship and plans, and was successful in having the same charter issued to himself.

In June, 1632, Lord Baltimore prepared to carry into effect the noble purpose of his illustrious father. Vessels were provided, conditions of settlement issued, and a colony organized. The leaders and controllers of the enterprise were Catholic gentlemen; and the artisans, laborers, and servants were Catholics and Protestants, between whom no distinction was made. The followers of each religion had the privilege of securing the services of clergymen of their profession, but the Protestants were too few to support a Protestant minister, while the Catholic colonists were accompanied by the learned and saintly Apostle of Maryland, Father Andrew White, and Father John Altham (or Gravenor), members of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, and by Thomas Gervase, a lay brother. The priests and their companions, servants, and lay coadjutors were entitled to take up lands and provide for their support like the other colonists; they were no charge on Lord Baltimore.

The expedition was placed in charge of Leonard Calvert, a brother of his lordship, who was appointed Governor of Maryland; and the vessels consisted of Lord Baltimore's own pinnace, the *Dove*, Robert Winter, captain, and the *Ark*, a chartered vessel, Richard Lowe, captain. After much opposition and many annoy-

ances, designed to delay or defeat the expedition, none of which daunted the brave heart of the Catholic nobleman or of Governor Calvert and his companions, the *Ark* and the *Dove*, freighted with the precious hope of freedom and of conscience, the pioneers of our own free institutions, the founders and legislators of civil and religious liberty in America, sailed, amid the prayers and benedictions of the just and good, from Cowes, on November 22, 1633.

After a stormy and protracted voyage, the colonists reached Chesapeake Bay in March, 1634. Father White wrote a detailed relation of the voyage, which gives us a most edifying account of this passage from the land of persecution to Freedom's chosen shores. The devotions and pious observances of the colonists are graphically described. From the exclusively Catholic character of every act performed, every litany chanted, and every name given to the points of land they passed, one would infer that the Protestants were few in number. On March 25, 1634, they landed on St. Clement's Island, and what followed we will give in Father White's own language, in his "Relatio Itineris," as translated:

> The year 1634 we celebrated the Mass for the first time on this island [St. Clement's]. This had never been done before in this part of the world.[1] After we had completed the sacrifice, we took upon our shoulders a great cross which we had hewn out of a tree, and advancing in order to the appointed place, with the assistance of the governor and his associates, and the other Catholics, we erected a trophy to Christ the Saviour, humbly reciting on our bended knees the Litanies of the Sacred Cross with great emotion.

Thus was founded the Land of the Sanctuary where all might worship and none be oppressed. From St. Clement's Governor Calvert visited the Indians of the neighborhood, and from their king, or chief, he purchased a territory of thirty miles. Due ceremonies were observed in taking possession. The Indian town, whose inhabitants were already abandoning their homes in fear of the fierce Susquehannas, was selected as the site of the settlement. It

[1] When Father White wrote these words, he was not aware that nine Spanish Jesuits had consecrated that territory with their blood over half a century before his arrival.

was called St. Mary's, and here the capital of the colony was established, and an oblong oval Indian bark house assigned to the Jesuit fathers, who, with Brother Gervase, soon converted it into a chapel. It stood near the old mulberry tree under which Governor Calvert parleyed with the Indians in friendly converse and purchased and paid for their lands. And here, too, in St. Mary's Catholic and Protestant dwelt together in harmony and peace.

The colonists were soon busy in erecting houses, the soil was tilled and planted, and the busy scenes of European life were enacted in the peaceful wilderness. The zealous priests immediately began to evangelize the gentle natives, to study their many dialects, and to found a Christian Church. In 1635 and 1637 other priests arrived, and in the latter year Father Philip Fisher became superior of the mission. The colonists soon located their lands, each gentleman being entitled to two hundred acres for every five men he brought over; and the priests, too, having no other provision made for them, availed themselves of the same conditions of plantation, and thus acquired in various localities bodies of land, the culture of which supported the entire body of the clergy in Maryland and maintained the missions. To this day the Jesuit missions and residences in Maryland stand on those ancient sites. Great success was experienced by the fathers in converting the Indians, and the good example of the converted king, Maquacomen of Patuxent, with whom Father White resided for some time, greatly aided them in their apostolic work.

By the express order of Lord Baltimore, set forth in a proclamation issued by him, perfect liberty of religious observance was accorded to the Protestants, who soon had a small church of their own, in the use and enjoyment of which they were protected. In 1637 and 1638 the General Assembly of the Province was convened, and all freemen were entitled to sit therein, including the Jesuit fathers; but the latter preferred giving their undivided time and labors to the sacred work of the Gospel, and asked to be excused from personal attendance. Laws were passed in 1638 for the prevention of religious dissension and excitement, and for protecting

all Christians in the worship of God according to their conscience; while the oath of office taken by the governors of Maryland from the first proves that religious liberty was the common law of the province from its foundation.

The work of the missionaries was zealous and untiring. Father Brock, now superior of the mission, labored, together with a lay brother, at St. Inigoes; Father Fisher, at St. Mary's, where a chapel was built and a cemetery laid out; Father Altham, among the numerous Indian population of Kent Island, on the Eastern Shore of Maryland; and Father White, successfully over a region one hundred and twenty miles in extent. But the young and hopeful Christian community had its misfortunes. The climatic diseases of the region did not spare them, and the severe labors and exposure of the priests made them especially liable to attack. Father John Knolles and Brother Gervase succumbed, the former within two months after his arrival. So also, in 1640, Fathers White and Altham were prostrated; the latter, exhausted by toil and hardship, fell a victim on November 5, 1640; while Father White, the main support of the missions, the master of the Indian languages, and the trusted friend of the red men, after recovery and relapse finally got well. But Father Brock, who had also enfeebled himself by his apostolic labors among the Anacostans, whose king he had converted, was accidentally shot while crossing the St. Mary's River. His loss was severely felt.

Notwithstanding these and other drawbacks, the young commonwealth waxed strong with increasing population. New accessions from the mother country were received every year, lands were granted to settlers and cultivated, improvements were erected, the Church flourished in conversions both among the Protestant whites and the Indians, and the mild and generous policy of Lord Baltimore, so well executed by his brother, Leonard Calvert, gave to the statesmanship of the world a lesson which is bearing noble fruit to our day.

The successes and reverses of the Maryland Church and colony were both great and seemed to come together. The conversion

of the young Empress of Piscataway, in 1642, by Father Fisher, then superior of the mission, encouraged the untiring labor of the devoted missionaries. This amiable Indian princess not only accepted Christianity with fervor, but also remained in the mission for Christian education and for the adoption of a civilized life. Father White, at Piscataway and at all the scattered stations, accomplished good results, and he continued to perfect himself in the mastery of the Indian languages. On one occasion this noble priest suffered greatly at the hands of the Puritan captain of a vessel on which he was a passenger on one of his trips of mercy, and made a narrow escape from being carried by force to New England, and also from perishing in the ice. But he availed himself of the opportunity to visit a neighboring Indian village and announce the Gospel of Jesus, which he did with great success, converting the chief of the village and the principal inhabitants. Whole families accepted the faith, and it only needed more missionaries to convert the entire population to Christianity. A number of Protestants from Virginia were also converted, a circumstance which aroused the animosity of the Virginia authorities, and a severe law, with penalties, was enacted against "Popish recusants." So great was the success of Father White at Port Tobacco that he abandoned Piscataway, exposed as it was to the ravages of the hostile Susquehannas, who had attacked a missionary station and slaughtered all the Europeans, and took up his residence at the former place.

Father Fisher, too, brought in golden conquests of faith. The Queen of Patuxent and her mother, the Queen of Port Tobacco, the wife and two sons of Tayac the Great, who had been acknowledged as emperor, and one hundred and thirty other Indians, accepted the Gospel. An account of how the missionaries conducted this great and arduous work, as given by one of their number, cannot fail to prove interesting:

> We [the priest, the interpreter, and a servant] are carried in a pinnace or galley, two rowing when the wind fails or is contrary, the other steering. We take with us a little chest of bread, butter, cheese, corn cut and dried

before ripening, beans, and a little flour; another chest with a bottle of wine for Mass, a bottle of holy water for baptism, an altar-stone, chalice, vestments; while a third box contains trifles for presents to the Indians—bells, combs, fish-hooks, needles, thread, etc.; a small mat to pitch as a tent when we have to sleep in the open air, and a larger one for rainy seasons. The servant is equipped for hunting, and for preparing food when taken. In our excursions we endeavor, where possible, to reach some English dwelling or Indian village by nightfall; if not, we land, and the missionary secures the boat, gathers wood, and builds a fire, while the others go out to hunt. If they take any game, it is prepared; if not, we lie down by the fire and take our rest. If fear of rain threatens, we erect our hut, and cover it with a larger mat spread over; and, thank God! we enjoy this humble fare with as joyful mind as we did more luxurious provisions in Europe: with this present comfort, that God imparts to us now a foretaste of what he will bestow on those who labor faithfully in this life, and he mitigates all hardships with a sense of pleasure, so that his Divine Majesty appears to be present with us in an extraordinary manner.

The harsh treatment meted out to Puritans in Virginia had driven many of them from that colony; Lord Baltimore had received them with hospitality, and extended over them the protection of religious liberty, as guaranteed by his proclamation. The royal authority in England was now overthrown, and the Puritan party had become powerful. But the Puritans proved ungrateful. In 1645, aided and abetted by Claiborne, the bitter enemy of the Catholics and of Lord Baltimore, and led on by one Ingle, a sea captain and man of desperate character, they assumed a hostile attitude toward the colony, held Kent Island by force against Governor Calvert's efforts to recover it, and, resolving to overthrow the Proprietary Government, invaded St. Mary's County, drove out the governor, who was forced to seek shelter in Virginia, and plundered the houses of the leading Catholics. The priests were also special objects of their cruelty and plunder; the missionary residences and estates at Potopaco and St. Inigoes were pillaged and almost destroyed; and the venerable Father White and Father Thomas Copley were seized, thrown into prison and ironed, and finally sent to England as prisoners.

In England these two noble confessors of the faith were indicted under the penal laws against Catholic priests; and although they pleaded that they had been brought to England by violence and against their will, and could not be lawfully convicted, they were by special order sent into perpetual banishment. Enfeebled by age, by the labors of the Maryland mission, and by the cruelty he suffered from Claiborne and Ingle, Father White sank into the grave. The saintly old priest predicted the day of his death, and received the last call with heroic virtue. He died on December 27, 1656, at the house of an English nobleman in Hampshire, near the residence of St. Thomas of Canterbury. His purity of life, his great learning, his ardent zeal and indomitable courage, all crowned by his heroic death, entitle him to rank among the noble martyrs of the Church. After the abduction of Fathers White and Copley, other priests remained in Maryland to continue the arduous work; but these, too, were hounded down by the Puritans. Some met death with noble faith and courage; others fled to Virginia. At the end of this shameful period of persecution there was not a Jesuit priest to be found in Maryland, the Land of the Sanctuary, which the Catholics had founded and thrown open to the very men who now turned on and destroyed their benefactors.

With the overthrow of Lord Baltimore's authority in Maryland, the Maryland Church, too, was banished. Lord Baltimore, thinking all was lost, sent orders for packing up and removing his personal effects. But his more resolute brother, Governor Leonard Calvert, assembled a force in Virginia, and returning to Maryland, suddenly recaptured the province for the Lord Proprietary, and the Jesuit missions were restored. Governor Calvert, however, spent with the labors and hardships of his arduous task, soon afterward succumbed, and died on June 9, 1647, leaving behind him a name illustrious among the enlightened, wise, and just law-givers of the world.

The increased immigration of Catholics from England, and the conversions effected by the fathers among the Protestant inhabitants, had given the undoubted numerical majority to the Cath-

olics, and the government of the colony was in Catholic hands, when Lord Baltimore appointed William Stone, a Protestant, as governor in 1647, exacting from him the oath in support of religious liberty.

We now approach the proudest event in the history of Catholic Maryland, first-fruits of the Assembly convened at St. Mary's on April 2, 1649, by Governor Stone, acting under Lord Baltimore's orders. A great Act of Religious Liberty was, with other laws, prepared in England and sent over by Lord Baltimore to Maryland for the action of the Assembly. This act was passed unanimously by a legislative body composed chiefly of Catholics, and approved by the Lord Proprietary on August 26, 1650. The statute, after forbidding and providing penalties for violence in religious controversy, and opprobrious epithets in religious disputes, contains the following noble enactment:

> And whereas, the enforcement of conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it has been practised; and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this Province, and the better to preserve mutual love and unity among the inhabitants, no person or persons whatsoever within this Province, or the islands, ports, harbors, creeks, or havens thereunto belonging, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth be any way troubled or molested, or discountenanced, for or in respect of his or her religion, in the free exercise thereof, within this Province or the islands thereunto belonging, nor any way compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion, against his or her consent.

This great statute not only received the praise of George Bancroft,[1] and of other illustrious historians and commentators, but Chalmers says that Lord Baltimore "laid the foundation of his province upon the broad basis of security to property and of freedom of religion."[2] And Judge Story says that Lord Baltimore "introduced into his fundamental policy the doctrine of general toleration and equality among Christian sects."[3] Dr. Döllinger, too (and his words will doubtless be received with great respect by

[1] History of the United States. [2] Annals. [3] Commentaries on the Constitution.

Protestants), says: "The first who were in earnest about religious freedom, and who really placed the two religions on an equality, were the Catholic Englishmen who, toward the middle of the seventeenth century, founded the colony of Maryland, under the leadership of Lord Baltimore."[1] Thus, too, Thomas Coit, a Protestant author, writes: "In Maryland, as the Roman Catholics claim, the rights of conscience were first really acknowledged in this country. This is a fact I never knew disputed by good authority; and, though a Protestant, with all my heart I accord them the full praise of it with the frankest sincerity."[2] Maryland now, with a majority of Catholic inhabitants estimated at three-fourths, seemed destined to a career of peace and prosperity.[3] The missions were sustained by the priests with holy zeal, and Lord Baltimore in 1651 granted to the Indians ten thousand acres of land.

In the same year a note of warning to Catholics was heard in an obnoxious oath prescribed by a legislature in which Protestants predominated. This unjust oath many Catholics refused to take. Persecution followed, under the commissioners representing the Commonwealth of England, and Maryland was again without priests and without a Church. But when the Commonwealth fell, the Proprietary Government of Maryland was restored, and the Jesuit missions again opened. Protestants now, however, outnumbered Catholics, and the position of the latter was precarious. Such was the Protestant feeling against Catholics that, during the pestilence which visited Maryland in 1670, when the scarcity of Protestant ministers threw nearly the entire care and visitation of the sick on the Catholic priests, the works and visits of mercy and consolation extended by these good men to the sick and dying were publicly and officially denounced as "Popish enormities," and Catholic priests were forbidden to visit the afflicted.

[1] The Church and the Churches.

[2] Puritanism; or, A Churchman's Defence.

[3] The voluntary testimony of these Protestant writers is cordially recommended to the narrow and pitiful souls who, in oath-bound and light-shunning conspiracies, whether of "Know-nothingism," "A. P. A.-ism," or other crazy "-ism," vent their futile bigotry and malice against their Catholic fellow-citizens.

In 1677 the first Catholic school in Maryland was established. This place of study was a preparation for St. Omer's, where its scholars went for the completion of their education, until the Catholics possessed their own college at Georgetown, after the overthrow of Great Britain and the establishment of the independence of the United States. Numerous Catholic churches were also built with means supplied by the piety of the faithful; and the Protestants, indifferent at first, had gradually erected a number of their own churches.

On the accession of William of Orange to the English throne, Maryland was proclaimed a royal province, and an act was passed by the legislature (from which Catholics were excluded) for the establishment of the Protestant religion in Catholic Maryland. The Church of England, once established, not only excluded and punished Catholics, but Puritans also, thus repaying the latter for their ingratitude in turning upon the very Catholics who had received and protected them in the province. Attempts were made to enforce on all the external practice of the established English worship and the use of the Book of Common Prayer in all places of religious worship; and nothing but the protests of Protestant non-conformists prevented this from being done. The Catholics, founders of the province and promulgators of religious liberty, were now the only victims of intolerance. Even the first Catholic shrine in Maryland, the little Chapel of St. Mary, was forcibly closed, and prosecutions were followed up against any priest who attempted to open or bless a Catholic place of worship.

Under all these persecutions the faithful increased, as has ever been the case from the earliest ages of the Church, and new priests came over from England to labor in that arduous vineyard. Jesuits and Franciscans worked in harmony, and made more converts than ever. But the death of Father Haddock, the last of the Franciscan missionaries, in 1720, ended the Franciscan mission in Maryland, and left the Jesuits sole laborers in the field. In 1725 these zealous men challenged the Protestant ministers to public discussion of their respective tenets of faith, but the latter declined the encounter.

In 1745 the Catholic school was removed to the quiet and secure shades of the flourishing mission of Bohemia. The success of this classical school was a marvel; the number of scholars averaged about forty, including the sons of the leading Catholic families. John Carroll, afterward first Bishop of the American Church, was a student at the Bohemia school, which was, in fact, the precursor of the present University of Georgetown. In 1746 the spirit of intolerance once more broke out against the Catholics, and additional severe legislation was attempted, which failed by reason of its excessive penalties; and yet the highest Protestant testimony vouches for their irreproachable lives and conduct. About 1757–58 the estimated number of Catholics in Maryland was ten thousand adult communicants, and as many more too young to receive holy communion.

In 1774 the devoted missionary band of Maryland received an important accession in the person of Rev. John Carroll, S. J. (the former student at the Bohemia classical school), who came from England and settled in his native country, influenced in great measure by the growing discontent of the American colonies under the British yoke.

And now drew near the great and bloody struggle that was to end in the complete overthrow of Great Britain and the evacuation of our country by the British forces. Catholics, as a religious body and as citizens of this great Republic, have just cause for pride at the part taken by their forefathers at the Revolutionary period in aid of the struggle for our national independence. The Catholics of the Revolution were singularly and exceptionally united in their support of the national cause. While the Methodists espoused the Tory and English cause; the Episcopalians were signally divided, and a large proportion of them opposed the cause of independence; the Quakers, availing themselves of their general opposition to all wars, were not with us; and the other sects were more or less divided, the few Catholics who supported the cause of England were persons of no position, and could almost be counted on one's fingers. Efforts of the British Government in

1778 and 1779 to form a royal regiment of Catholics proved an utter failure.

The sympathies of the entire Catholic body, priests and people, were with the cause of American independence. Catholics joined the American army and served in the militia in great numbers. The muster-rolls of the army show that it literally swarmed with Roman Catholic soldiers; and while it is obviously impossible to mention all the Catholic officers who signally distinguished themselves in the service of their country, a few names may be taken from those glorious rolls. In the Pennsylvania State Line, Stephen Moylan, brother of Bishop Moylan, served as an officer under Washington at the siege of Boston, won the confidence and personal friendship of the commander-in-chief, and in 1777 was made a colonel of cavalry. General John Sullivan was one of the illustrious leader's most trusted commanders. Commodore John Barry, in the navy, rendered most gallant and valuable services in several engagements; the British flag was several times lowered to his victorious ship, the *Lexington*; he was singularly and almost uniformly victorious, and is regarded in history as "the Founder of the American navy."[1] In the Pennsylvania State Line the gallant services of Colonel Doyle and Captain Michael McGuire also deserve mention. In the Maryland Line, Washington's favorite soldiers, the names of old Catholic families often occur on the muster-rolls. All the Catholic clergy of Maryland and Pennsylvania threw their influence on the side of the struggling colonies. The Rev. Peter Gibault, Catholic pastor at Kaskaskia, also rendered important service to the Continental cause. He went from village to village, exhorting the French and Indian members of his flock to adhere to the cause of the struggling colonies. He celebrated the first Fourth of July in the late French territory of the Illinois at Kaskaskia; and when the Kaskaskia Company, under Captain Charlevoix, joined the forces sent to reduce Vincennes, he bestowed the blessing of the Church on the men and the cause. Another French com-

[1] As these words are penned, the Congress of the United States has under consideration the erection of a monument to commemorate fittingly the services of this great man to his country.

pany of Catholics, under Captain Vigo, rendered gallant service to the patriot cause. In 1780, when Detroit was in the hands of the British, among the most gallant of the brave men sent to recover the place was the Catholic captain La Balme, who fell heroically in the attack. On land and sea, wherever a Catholic was found, his bravery was conspicuous.

The scope of this chapter makes it impossible to include any detailed account of the invaluable services rendered by Catholic France and the other Catholic powers of Europe to the cause of American independence, both by their armies and their fleets. Many Catholic military and scientific men and officers, at the outset of the struggle, volunteered their services to Congress, and brought to the patriot cause the skill and experience acquired in European scientific schools and on European battle-fields. To France are we chiefly indebted for most important aid in our struggle. While Hessians and other military hirelings were drawn by England from Protestant countries, all the Catholic nations manifested their sympathy with the American cause. France sent over not only her armies and fleets, but also aided Congress with money and war supplies. Spain, too, sent over financial and warlike aid. The Catholic states of Italy and the Catholic princes of Germany, by their opposition, put an end to England's drawing mercenaries from Protestant Germany. Among the European Catholic heroes who fought for our cause we should mention Lafayette, Rochambeau, Armand, Pulaski, Duponceau, of the land forces, and Count de Grasse, of the French navy. Not only did these and others fight side by side with the Continentals, but many of them rendered invaluable services in drilling and disciplining the Continental recruits, and in turning raw militiamen into trained soldiers.

Educated with traditional prejudices against Catholics and their faith, the American people now saw cause for thinking better of them, both in the loyalty and services of American Catholics and in the invaluable aid rendered to us by Catholic countries, and again by being brought in contact with cultivated and able military and naval officers, and with pious, learned, and accomplished priests,

who came as chaplains in the French army and fleet. These chaplains gave Catholic services at the posts where they were on duty, for the French and such Americans as might attend. A change of sentiment came over the public mind. The selectmen of Boston followed the crucifix in procession through the streets of the city. A similar scene was witnessed in Newport, and at the celebration of Mass and the chanting of the " Te Deum " at Philadelphia after the surrender of Cornwallis.

The services rendered to our cause by Catholic Spain have never been sufficiently appreciated. While England was intriguing for the alliance of Russia, and the privilege of enlisting in Russia soldiers to fight against us, Spain induced the European powers to assume an armed neutrality, thus defeating England's schemes in Russia, the latter country joining the other neutral nations. Spain also offered to mediate between England and her colonies. Later she declared war against England, and the Spanish authorities in Louisiana extended sympathy and support to our cause by protecting and aiding our ships. The Spanish commander there besieged Baton Rouge, then in possession of the English, and compelled its surrender. Pensacola was garrisoned by English soldiers and by Hessians. The Spanish commander Galvez, joining the French and Spanish squadrons, assisted with land forces the siege of the place, forced its surrender, and broke the power of England at the south. So, too, the coöperation of the French citizens of our northwestern and western territories was spontaneous, gallant, and serviceable. While Protestant sentiment in Europe generally inclined against us, every Catholic impulse was in our favor.

Prominent among the Catholic laity was Charles Carroll, who had already gained reputation as a patriot at the outset of the controversy by triumphantly defending the rights and freedom of Americans, under the title of " First Citizen," against Daniel Dulany, then the ablest lawyer in Maryland, if not in the whole country, a friend of the royal cause, who wrote under the title of " Second Citizen." Mr. Carroll, a man of large wealth and a de-

vout Catholic, was a liberal benefactor of the Church, and had given a site for a church in Baltimore. He was also one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and the last survivor of that illustrious body of citizens who had put their names to the immortal Charter of Liberty. When he was about to sign his name to the Declaration, some one remarked: "There go several millions; but there are several of the same name." Mr. Carroll, who had by this time signed his name, in order that no doubt might exist as to which Charles Carroll it was, added to his signature the name of his estate and residence, "of Carrollton;" and few names in American annals are more distinguished than that of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Governor Lee of Maryland was also a prominent Catholic patriot and promoter of the success of the War of Independence. Daniel Carroll, patriot brother of patriot priest, was influential in behalf of the struggling colonies. Governor Lee, Mr. Carroll, and Thomas Fitzsimmons were members of the Continental Congress.

In 1776 Congress sent an embassy to Canada to secure its alliance or neutrality. This embassy was composed of four eminent citizens, two of whom were Catholics. The commissioners were Benjamin Franklin, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Samuel Chase, and Rev. John Carroll. The journey to Canada was made in winter, and it was no small undertaking to meet the exposure, fatigue, and inconveniences of such a journey before railroads were introduced. The commissioners found the Canadians content with their condition under British rule. The Quebec Act gave them all they could demand for their religion, and the sentiments of hostility to the Catholic faith which had been manifested in Congress and among the American people, though entirely offset by Catholic patriotism in the Revolution, repelled the Canadians. Dr. Carroll pleaded our cause with the Canadian clergy as well as he could, but found his mission fruitless. He and Dr. Franklin returned to Philadelphia in May, travelling from Albany in a private carriage. On his return, Dr. Carroll resumed his missionary labors at Rock Creek.

After the adoption of the Constitution and the election of

Washington as first President, the Catholics of the United States, through Rev. John Carroll (who was already elected, though not yet consecrated, first Catholic bishop), Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and Daniel Carroll of Maryland, Dominick Lynch of New York, and Thomas Fitzsimmons of Philadelphia, representing the clergy and laity, in March, 1790, presented an address to President Washington, and received from him an answer honorable alike to that illustrious man and to those he addressed. The address and the reply are as follows:

THE ADDRESS.

SIR: We have been long impatient to testify our joy and unbounded confidence on your being called by a unanimous vote to the first station of a country in which that unanimity could not have been obtained without the previous merit of unexampled services, of eminent wisdom and unblemished virtue. Our congratulations have not reached you sooner because our scattered situations prevented the communication and collecting of those sentiments which warmed every breast. But delay has furnished us with the opportunity not only of presaging the happiness to be expected under your administration, but of bearing testimony to that which we experience. It is your peculiar talent, in war and in peace, to afford security to those who commit their protection into your hands. In war you shield them from the ravages of armed hostility, in peace you establish public tranquillity by the justice and moderation not less than by the vigor of your government. By example as well as by vigilance you extend the influence of laws on the manners of your fellow-citizens. You encourage respect for religion, and inculcate, by words and actions, that principle on which the welfare of nations so much depends—that a superintending Providence governs the events of the world and watches over the conduct of men. Your exalted maxims and unwearied attention to the moral and physical improvement of your country have produced already the happiest effects. Under your administration America is animated with zeal for the attainment and encouragement of useful literature; she improves agriculture, extends her commerce, and acquires with foreign nations a dignity unknown to her before. From these happy events, in which none can feel a warmer interest than ourselves, we derive additional pleasure by recollecting that you, Sir, have been the principal instrument to effect so rapid a change in our political situation. This prospect of national prosperity is peculiarly pleasing to us

on another account, because while our country preserves her freedom and independence, we shall have a well-founded title to claim from her justice the equal rights of citizenship as the price of our blood spilt under your eyes, and of our common exertions for her defence under your auspicious conduct—rights rendered more dear to us by the remembrance of former hardships. When we pray for the preservation of them where they have been granted, and expect the full extension of them from the justice of those States which restrict them—when we solicit the protection of Heaven over our common country, we neither omit nor can omit recommending your preservation to the singular care of Divine Providence, because we conceive that no human means are so available to promote the welfare of the United States as the prolongation of your health and life, in which are included the energy of your example, the wisdom of your counsels, and the persuasive eloquence of your virtues.

In behalf of the Roman Catholic clergy,

J. Carroll.

In behalf of the Roman Catholic laity,

Charles Carroll of Carrollton.
Daniel Carroll.
Thomas Fitzsimmons.
Dominick Lynch.

President Washington's Reply.

Gentlemen: While I now receive with much satisfaction your congratulations on my being called by a unanimous vote to the first station of my country, I cannot but duly notice your politeness in offering an apology for the unavoidable delay. As that delay has given you an opportunity of realizing, instead of anticipating, the benefits of the General Government, you will do me the justice to believe that your testimony of the increase of the public prosperity enhances the pleasure which I would otherwise have experienced from your affectionate address. I feel that my conduct in war and in peace has met with more general approbation than could reasonably be expected; and I find myself disposed to consider that fortunate circumstance, in a great degree, resulting from the able support and extraordinary candor of my fellow-citizens of all denominations. The prospect of national prosperity now before us is truly animating, and ought to excite the exertions of all good men to establish and secure the happiness of their country in the permanent duration of its freedom and independence.

America, under the smiles of a Divine Providence, the protection of a good government, and the cultivation of manners, morals, and piety, cannot fail of attaining an uncommon degree of eminence in literature, commerce, agriculture, improvements at home and respectability abroad. As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community are equally entitled to the protection of civil government. I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality; and I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their Revolution and the establishment of their government, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed. I thank you, gentlemen, for your kind concern for me. While my life and health shall continue, in whatever situation I may be, it shall be my constant endeavor to justify the favorable sentiments which you are pleased to express of my conduct; and may the members of your society in America, animated alone by the pure spirit of Christianity, and still conducting themselves as the faithful subjects of our free government, enjoy every temporal and spiritual felicity.

G. Washington.

This chapter cannot be more fittingly concluded than by quoting from an eminent Catholic writer words which apply with peculiar force to conditions which confront us in our beloved country to-day:

The Catholic Church has flourished under all forms of government. Her Divine Founder has given her an organism capable of adjustment to every legitimate human institution. She tends to make the people loyal to the reasonable authority of the state, and her influence will strengthen them in the virtues necessary for the public welfare. She has always done so.

But the form of government of the United States is preferable to Catholics above other forms. It is more favorable than others to the practice of those virtues which are the necessary conditions of the development of the religious life of man. This government leaves men a larger margin for liberty of action, and hence for coöperation with the guidance of the Holy Spirit, than any other government under the sun. . . . The Catholic Church will, therefore, flourish all the more in this republican country in proportion as Catholics in their civil life keep to the lines of their republicanism. . . .

We do not need the imperial or kingly ideas of the Old World as aids to our spiritual life as Catholics, any more than we want its anarchical ideas as helps to civil freedom as citizens. . . . If, as many think, democracy will soon assume control of public affairs, the question is, What kind of a democracy will it be—what influence will be powerful enough to guide it morally aright? No sectarian form of Christianity can be the guide of mighty human forces. So far as men are sectarians, so far do they deviate from the universal truth; and only the universal principles of reason and revelation, grasped and wielded by such an organic world-power as the Catholic Church, can guide aright the tumultuous masses of mankind when the transition from one phase of civilization to another has begun. The power that could tame the barbarian ancestors of the civilized world exhibits . . . a force competent to guide to its proper destiny the baptized democracy of our day.

THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY

THE following is a list of the apostolic delegates, archbishops, and bishops in the United States and its dependencies, together with the Catholic population of each archdiocese and diocese, and the total Catholic population of the United States (estimated, 1909):

APOSTOLIC DELEGATES

United States—His Excellency Most Rev. Diomede Falconio, D.D.
Philippine Islands—His Excellency Most Rev. Ambrose Agius, O.S.B.

CARDINAL

Baltimore—His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. Catholic population, 250,000.[1]

ARCHBISHOPS

Boston—Most Rev. John J. Williams, D.D. (Auxiliary Bishop, Right Rev. John Brady, D.D.) Catholic population, 700,000.

Chicago—Most Rev. James Edward Quigley, D.D. Catholic population, 1,150,000.

Cincinnati—Most Rev. Henry Moeller, D.D. Catholic population, 200,000.

Dubuque—Most Rev. John J. Keane, D.D. Catholic population, 108,800.

Milwaukee—Most Rev. Sebastian Gebhard Messmer, D.D. Catholic population, 235,000.

New Orleans—See vacant. Administrator, Right Rev. Gustave A. Rouxel, D.D. Catholic population, 450,000.

New York—Most Rev. John M. Farley, D.D. (Auxiliary Bishop, Right Rev. Thomas F. Cusack, D.D.) Catholic population, 1,220,000.

Oregon—Most Rev. Alexander Christie, D.D. Catholic population, 40,000.

[1] In giving the Catholic population, the archdiocese is understood in each case.

Philadelphia—Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, D.D. (Auxiliary Bishop, Right Rev. Edmond F. Prendergast, D.D.) Catholic population, 525,000.

St. Louis—Most Rev. John Joseph Glennon, D.D. Catholic population, 375,000.

St. Paul—Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D. Catholic population, 230,000.

San Francisco—Most Rev. Patrick William Riordan, D.D. (Coadjutor, Most Rev. George Montgomery, D.D.) Catholic population, 227,000.

Santa Fé—Most Rev. Peter Bourgade, D.D. (Auxiliary Bishop, Right Rev. John Baptist Pitaval, D.D.) Catholic population, white, 115,000; Indian, 18,000.

Manila, Philippine Islands—Most Rev. Jeremiah J. Harty, D.D. Catholic population, 1,891,826.

BISHOPS

Albany—Right Rev. Thomas M. A. Burke, D.D. Catholic population, 172,755.[1]

Alton—Right Rev. James Ryan, D.D. Catholic population, 75,000.

Altoona—Right Rev. Eugene A. Garvey, D.D. Catholic population, 50,000.

Baker City—Right Rev. Charles J. O'Reilly, D.D. Catholic population, white, 3,500; Indian, 532.

Belleville—Right Rev. John Janssen, D.D. Catholic population, 56,200.

Boise—Right Rev. A. J. Glorieux, D.D. Catholic population, 14,000.

Brooklyn—Right Rev. Charles E. McDonnell, D.D. Catholic population, 700,000.

Buffalo—Right Rev. Charles Henry Colton, D.D. Catholic population, 244,739.

Burlington—Right Rev. John Stephen Michaud, D.D. Catholic population, 70,000.

Charleston—Right Rev. Henry P. Northrop, D.D. Catholic population, 8,500.

Cheyenne—Right Rev. James J. Keane, D.D. Catholic population, 4,000.

Cleveland—Right Rev. Ignatius F. Horstmann, D.D. Catholic population, 325,000.

Columbus—Right Rev. James J. Hartley, D.D. Catholic population, 75,373.

[1] In giving the Catholic population, the diocese is understood in each case.

Concordia—Right Rev. John Francis Cunningham, D.D. Catholic population, 24,450.

Covington—Right Rev. Camillus Paul Maes, D.D. Catholic population, 50,000.

Dallas—Right Rev. Edward Joseph Dunne, D.D. Catholic population, 35,000.

Davenport—Right Rev. Henry Cosgrove, D.D. (Coadjutor Bishop, Right Rev. James Davis, D.D.) Catholic population, 70,000.

Denver—Right Rev. Nicholas Chrysostom Matz, D.D. Catholic population, 70,000.

Detroit—Right Rev. John S. Foley, D.D. Catholic population, 230,000.

Duluth—Right Rev. James McGolrick, D.D. Catholic population, 55,000.

Erie—Right Rev. John E. FitzMaurice, D.D. Catholic population, 70,000.

Fall River—Right Rev. William Stang, D.D. Catholic population, 130,000.

Fargo—Right Rev. John Shanley, D.D. Catholic population, white, 46,137; Indian, 5,863.

Fort Wayne—Right Rev. Herman Joseph Alerding, D.D. Catholic population, 81,000.

Galveston—Right Rev. Nicholas A. Gallagher, D.D. Catholic population, 42,000.

Grand Rapids—Right Rev. Henry Joseph Richter, D.D. Catholic population, families, 21,435.

Great Falls—Right Rev. Mathias C. Lenihan, D.D. Catholic population, 12,000.

Green Bay—Right Rev. Joseph J. Fox, D.D. Catholic population, 135,000.

Harrisburg—Right Rev. John W. Shanahan, D.D. Catholic population, 51,547.

Hartford—Right Rev. Michael Tierney, D.D. Catholic population, 315,000.

Helena—Right Rev. John P. Carroll, D.D. Catholic population, 40,000.

Indianapolis—Right Rev. Francis Silas Chatard, D.D. (Auxiliary Bishop, Right Rev. Denis O'Donaghue, D.D.) Catholic population, 110,009.

Kansas City—Right Rev. John Joseph Hogan, D.D. Catholic population, 52,000.

La Crosse—Right Rev. James Schwebach, D.D. Catholic population, 97,165.

Lead—Right Rev. John Stariha, D.D. Catholic population, white, 5,000; Indian, 5,000.

Leavenworth—Right Rev. Thomas F. Lillis, D.D. Catholic population, 41,000.

Lincoln—Right Rev. Thomas Bonacum, D.D. Catholic population, 30,000.

Little Rock—Right Rev. Edward FitzGerald, D.D. Catholic population, 17,000.

Louisville—Right Rev. William George McCloskey, D.D. Catholic population, 104,521.

Manchester—Right Rev. John Bernard Delany, D.D. Catholic population, 105,000.

Marquette—Right Rev. Frederick Eis, D.D. Catholic population, 80,000.

Mobile—Right Rev. Edward P. Allen, D.D. Catholic population, 28,397.

Monterey and Los Angeles—Right Rev. Thomas James Conaty, D.D. Catholic population, 70,000.

Nashville—Right Rev. Thomas Sebastian Byrne, D.D. Catholic population, 18,000.

Natchez—Right Rev. Thomas Heslin, D.D. Catholic population, 21,141.

Natchitoches—Right Rev. Cornelius Van de Ven, D.D. Catholic population, 32,000.

Nesqually—Right Rev. Edward John O'Dea, D.D. Catholic population, 75,000.

Newark—Right Rev. John Joseph O'Connor, D.D. Catholic population, 315,000.

Ogdensburg—Right Rev. Henry Gabriels, D.D. Catholic population, 85,000.

Oklahoma—Right Rev. Theophile Meerschaert, D.D. Catholic population, white, 21,880; Indian, 3,400; colored, 220.

Omaha—Right Rev. Richard Scannell, D.D. Catholic population, 65,175.

Peoria—Right Rev. John Lancaster Spalding, D.D. (Auxiliary Bishop, Right Rev. Peter J. O'Reilly, D.D.) Catholic population, 123,500.

Pittsburg—Right Rev. J. F. Regis Canevin, D.D. Catholic population, 425,000.

Portland—Right Rev. William H. O'Connell, D.D. Catholic population, 110,321.

Providence—Right Rev. Matthew Harkins, D.D. Catholic population, 200,000.

Richmond—Right Rev. A. Van de Vyver, D.D. Catholic population, 30,000.

Rochester—Right Rev. Bernard J. McQuaid, D.D. (Coadjutor Bishop, Right Rev. Thomas F. Hickey, D.D.) Catholic population, 115,000.

Sacramento—Right Rev. Thomas Grace, D.D. Catholic population, 41,000.

St. Augustine—Right Rev. William John Kenny, D.D. Catholic population, 26,000.

St. Cloud—Right Rev. James Trobec, D.D. Catholic population, 44,000.

St. Joseph—Right Rev. Maurice F. Burke, D.D. Catholic population, 20,000.

Salt Lake—Right Rev. Lawrence Scanlan, D.D. Catholic population, 10,000.

San Antonio—Right Rev. John Anthony Forest, D.D. Catholic population, 78,000.

Savannah—Right Rev. Benjamin J. Keiley, D.D. Catholic population, 23,000.

Scranton—Right Rev. Michael John Hoban, D.D. Catholic population, 265,000.

Sioux City—Right Rev. Philip Joseph Garrigan, D.D. Catholic population, 50,000.

Sioux Falls—Right Rev. Thomas O'Gorman, D.D. Catholic population, white, 45,000; Indian, 500.

Springfield—Right Rev. Thomas D. Beaven, D.D. Catholic population, 297,000.

Superior—Right Rev. Augustin Francis Schinner, D.D. Catholic population, white, 35,000; Indian, 3,861.

Syracuse—Right Rev. Patrick A. Ludden, D.D. Catholic population, 117,500.

Trenton—Right Rev. James A. McFaul, D.D. Catholic population, 133,149.

Tucson—Right Rev. Henry Granjon, D.D. Catholic population, 40,000.

Washington, D. C.—Right Rev. Bonaventure F. Broderick, D.D.

Wheeling—Right Rev. Patrick James Donahue, D.D. Catholic population, 35,400.

Wichita—Right Rev. John Joseph Hennessy, D.D. Catholic population, 26,500.

Wilmington—Right Rev. John James Monaghan, D.D. Catholic population, 30,000.

Winona—Right Rev. Joseph B. Cotter, D.D. Catholic population, 47,000.

Porto Rico—Right Rev. James H. Blenk, S.M., D.D. Catholic population, about 1,000,000.

Cebu, Philippine Islands—Right Rev. Thomas Augustine Hendrick, D.D.

Jaro, Philippine Islands—Right Rev. Frederick Z. Rooker, D.D. Catholic population, 1,331,194.

Nueva Segovia, Philippine Islands—Right Rev. Denis J. Dougherty, D.D.

Camarines (Nueva Caceres), Philippine Islands—See vacant. Catholic population, about 700,000.

VICARS APOSTOLIC

Brownsville, Texas—Right Rev. Peter Verdaguer, D.D. Catholic population, 75,000.[1]

North Carolina—Right Rev. Leo Haid, O.S.B., D.D. Catholic population, 4,800.

Hawaiian (Sandwich) Islands—Right Rev. Libert Hubert Boeynaems.

PREFECT APOSTOLIC

Alaska—Very Rev. Joseph Raphael Crimont, S.J. Catholic population, white, 4,500; native, 5,000.

Total Catholic population of the United States (exclusive of its dependencies), 14,235,451.

[1] In giving the Catholic population, the vicariate apostolic is understood in each case.

CATHOLIC INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING IN THE UNITED STATES

Among the countless institutions of learning established, supported, or fostered by the Catholic Church in the United States are the following, many of which are famous the world over:

Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. The university now comprises the following schools: Sacred Sciences, Philosophy, Letters, Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, Social Sciences, American History, Jurisprudence, Law, and Technological Sciences. Officers of the Board of Trustees: His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, S.T.D., president; Most Rev. John J. Williams, S.T.D., vice-president; Right Rev. Camillus P. Maes, S.T.D., secretary; Michael Jenkins, Esq., treasurer; Rev. George A. Dougherty, assistant treasurer. Affiliated institutions: Institute of Pedagogy, New York; St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.; St. Thomas Aquinas College, Brookland, D. C.; Marist College, Brookland, D. C.; Holy Cross College, Washington, D. C.; College of the Holy Land, Brookland, D. C.; St. Austin's College, Washington, D. C.; Apostolic Mission House, Washington, D. C.

Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. This institution contains Graduate School, Collegiate Department, Department of Law, Post-Graduate Course in Law, Medical Department, Hospital Staff, Dental Department, and Preparatory Department.

Theological Seminary of St. Sulpice and St. Mary's University, Baltimore, Md.

St. Joseph's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.

Epiphany Apostolic College, Baltimore, Md.

St. Charles College, Ellicott City, Md.

Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary and Mount St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, Md.

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind. The curriculum of the university includes thirteen full collegiate courses, besides full courses in art and music.

St. John's Ecclesiastical Seminary, Boston, Mass.

Boston College, Boston, Mass.

College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.

Colleges of St. Ignatius, St. Vincent, St. Procopius, and many other educational institutions, Chicago, Ill.

Spalding Institute, Peoria, Ill.

St. Gregory's Preparatory Seminary, St. Xavier's College, and others, Cincinnati, Ohio.

St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Cleveland, Ohio.

St. Joseph's College, Dubuque, Iowa.

Provincial Seminary of St. Francis de Sales, Marquette College, and numerous others, Milwaukee, Wis.

St. Louis Diocesan Seminary, College of the Immaculate Conception, Loyola, Holy Cross, and other colleges, New Orleans, La.

Fordham University, New York, N. Y. The university comprises Collegiate, Medical, Law, and Preparatory Departments, and Missionary Band.

St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y. The seminary contains Departments of Theology and Philosophy.

Cathedral College, College of St. Francis Xavier, Manhattan College, St. Leonard's Academy, and many other academies, institutes, colleges, and convent schools in New York City and vicinity.

Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J.

Columbia University, St. Mary's Academy and College, and other institutions of learning, Portland, Ore.

Theological Seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, and other seminaries and colleges, Philadelphia, Pa.

Pittsburg Catholic College of the Holy Ghost, Pittsburg, Pa.

St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. The university comprises Divinity and Philosophy, Undergraduate, and Medical Departments, and Missionary Bands.

St. Paul Seminary, Groveland Park, and the College of St. Thomas, Merriam Park, Minn. The United States War Department has detailed an officer for work exclusively in the College of St. Thomas, and has granted the equipment of arms, etc., allowed to military schools.

St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park; St. Ignatius' College, San Francisco; and other seminaries, academies, and colleges in the State of California.

St. Michael's College, Santa Fé; St. Nicholas' Academy, Bernalillo; and other academies and schools in the Territory of New Mexico.

St. Aloysius' Academy, Lewiston; St. Teresa's Academy, Boise; and other schools in the State of Idaho.

College of the Sacred Heart, Denver, Col.

SS. Cyrillus' and Methodius' Seminary and Detroit College, Detroit, Mich.

Creighton University, Creighton College, John A. Creighton Medical College, and Creighton College of Law, Dental College, and College of Pharmacy, Omaha, Neb.

La Salle Academy, Providence, R. I.

Theological Seminary, San Antonio; St. Edward's College, Austin; St. Joseph's College, Brownsville; and other colleges and schools in the State of Texas.

St. Louis College, Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands.

Many colleges, seminaries, academies, and schools teaching both English and Spanish in Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC COLLEGES IN EUROPE

Pontifical College of the United States, Rome, Italy.

American College of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Louvain, Belgium.

PIOUS ASSOCIATIONS AND SOCIETIES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

Among the many benevolent associations through which the Catholic Church labors incessantly in America for the spiritual welfare of humanity, may be mentioned the following:

The Apostleship of Prayer, a pious association which exercises the apostolic office of promoting the glory of God and the salvation of souls by prayer, both mental and vocal, and also by other pious works in so far as they are prayerful and unite us with the Sacred Heart of Jesus. It has sixty thousand local centres in different parts of the world, with a membership of at least thirty millions, about five millions of whom belong to the sixty-five hundred local centres in the United States. The director-general is the General of the Society of Jesus. In the United States the central office of the Apostleship of Prayer is in New York City.

Priests' Eucharistic League, established by Père Eymard, founder of the Congregation of the Most Blessed Sacrament. The object of the league is to promote devotion to the Most Blessed Sacrament by the clergy and people. Protector: Right Rev. Mgr. Camillus Paul Maes, D.D., Bishop of Covington, Ky.

Society for the Propagation of the Faith, founded in Lyons, in 1822, for the purpose of assisting, by prayers and alms, the Catholic missionaries who are engaged in preaching the Gospel in heathen and non-Catholic countries. The society contributes, at the present time, toward the support of three hundred and twenty-five dioceses, vicariates, and prefectures apostolic in Africa, Asia, Oceanica, America, and the non-Catholic countries of Europe. Since its foundation it has given to the various missions of the world about seventy millions of dollars, of which nearly six millions were apportioned to missions in the United States.[1]

[1] See "The Propaganda," in Volume I, chapter iv.

The Association of the Holy Childhood for the Redemption of the Children of Infidels, established at Paris, in 1843, by the Right Rev. Charles de Forbin-Jansen, Bishop of Nancy. Its object is twofold: First, to rally around the Infant Jesus our little Christian children from their tender years, so that with their increasing years and strength, and in imitation of Jesus their Master, they may practise true Christian charity. Second, that by the practice of true Christian charity and enduring liberality those same little Christian children may coöperate to save from death and sin the thousands upon thousands of children that, in pagan countries like China, are cast away and neglected by their parents, and in many cases die unbaptized; to procure holy baptism for those abandoned little ones; and, should they live, to make of them craftsmen, teachers, doctors, or priests, who all, in turn, will spread the blessings of the Christian religion among their countrymen.

St. Joseph's Society for Negro Missions, incorporated under the laws of Maryland in 1898, for the evangelization of the American colored people. The society is composed of clergy and laity. Its clergy are secular priests ordained in the same way as the diocesan clergy *ad titulum missionis*. The priests of St. Joseph are essentially missionaries; hence they take the title of their ordination from the missions, and, like all sons of the Propaganda, must look to the missions for support.[1]

Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America, a confederation of all the temperance societies in the United States that are approved by the pastors of their respective churches. The union embraces eighty-nine thousand members, enrolled in ten hundred and thirty-eight societies. President: Right Rev. Regis Canevin, D.D., Pittsburg, Pa.

Catholic Young Men's National Union. President: Rev. Walter J. Shanley, Danbury, Conn. Vice-President: Rev. T. J. Leonard, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Catholic Mutual Relief Society of America, organized by the

[1] See "The Propaganda," in Volume I, chapter iv.

late Right Rev. James O'Connor, D.D., in 1889, and incorporated under the laws of the State of Nebraska in 1896.

Association of the Secular Polish Roman Catholic Clergy in the United States, incorporated in accordance with the laws of Wisconsin in 1902. The purpose of the association is to promote Christian education among the Polish people, to encourage and enable them to take a more pronounced interest in Catholic public life, and to help them to insist on their rights in cases where they are slighted.

International Catholic Truth Society, organized for the purpose of answering inquiries concerning the doctrines of the Catholic Church; to refute misleading statements and calumnies; to promote the interests of Catholic affairs through the medium of the press; to stimulate among the Catholic laity a desire for higher education, and otherwise to encourage the circulation of Catholic literature; and to perform other educational missionary work. Honorary President: Right Rev. Charles E. McDonnell, D.D., Bishop of Brooklyn. Honorary Vice-President: Charles J. Bonaparte, Secretary of the United States Navy.

Catholic Truth Society (of the West), incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois in 1901. Its object is to publish and distribute Catholic pamphlets, essays, and tracts. President: D. F. Bremner. Prefect: Rev. T. E. Sherman, S.J. The central office of the society is in Chicago.

Catholic Missionary Union, an organization established "to procure the services of clergymen and laymen of the Roman Catholic Church to teach and preach as missionaries of their faith in the United States, and in furtherance of religious opinion; to provide for the support and maintenance of such persons while engaged in such work; to lease, take, hold, and purchase places, buildings, and lands for such teaching and preaching; to publish and distribute books, pamphlets, and reading matter in connection with such work; and to aid and assist the archbishops, bishops, and other authorities of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States in establishing and carrying on home missions in their various juris-

dictions." The union is incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. Directors: Most Rev. John M. Farley, D.D., Archbishop of New York; Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia; Right Rev. Matthew Harkins, D.D., Bishop of Providence; Very Rev. E. R. Dyer; Rev. Matthew A. Taylor; Rev. A. P. Doyle; and Rev. Walter Elliott. Office: Brookland Station, Washington, D. C.

Priests' Total Abstinence League of America. Honorary President: Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia.

Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, established in 1874 by the Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore, upon the recommendation, and for and in behalf, of the Catholic prelates having Indian missions within the limits of their dioceses, for the purpose of representing to the United States Government the interests and needs of the said prelates in all matters pertaining to Indian affairs. The principal work of the bureau is the establishment of boarding and day schools among the Indian tribes, and the procurement from the Government and other sources of funds for their support and maintenance. Executive Board: His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, President; Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia; Rev. William H. Ketcham, Director. Treasurer: Very Rev. E. R. Dyer, D.D. Secretary: Charles S. Lusk. The office of the bureau is in Washington, D. C.

Commission for the Catholic Missions among the Colored People and the Indians, established for distributing the funds collected annually, by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in behalf of the Catholic Missions among the colored people and the Indians. The commission consists of His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, Chairman; Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia; and Most Rev. John M. Farley, D.D., Archbishop of New York. Secretary: Very Rev. E. R. Dyer, D.D., St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.

BOOK VI

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

CHAPTER XXIII

CATHOLIC EDUCATION [1]

The truth of God, announced in the name of his holy Church—Education one of the most important questions of the day—Essential to the well-being of society—The curse of utter ignorance—Intelligence the highest portion of the soul of man—Human society based upon intellectual communication—Menace of the uneducated—The Catholic Church, true mother of souls, demands education—Faith in God its foundation—Definition of faith—The Church imposes duties that require a highly trained and well-educated intellect—Prayer and the sacraments as intellectual aids—Self-interest the world's appeal—The Church's, not self, but charity—Her revelation of spiritual beauties—Singular delusion of Protestants—Their blind complacency—Education in Rome—Catholic schools—Work of the Christian Brothers and the Nuns—Educating the children of the poor—The utterly ignorant man an enemy of the Church—Illiterate Protestants rarely converted—Great conversions among the most highly educated and cultivated persons—The Catholic Church the true fountainhead and source of education—The truth personified—Three systems of education in America—Teaching without God—Perfection unattainable without the aid of Jesus Christ—The Christian's chief purpose in life—God in the very first passage of history—Philosophy begins in God—Human science, in its ultimate analysis, falls back upon the First Truth: God—Uneducated educators—The child is father to the man—Moral training as essential as mental—An intellectual monster—Trying to put God in the American Constitution—A Protestant school conducted on Protestant principles—The Divinity of Jesus Christ denied by many Protestant clergymen—Catholic schools first in educational work—St. Paul's words on education without God—The Catholic system develops the child's soul and mind—"Suffer children to come to Me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God."

I PROPOSE to speak to you this evening on the question of "Catholic Education." My attention was attracted this morning to a notice in one of the leading papers of this city, in which the writer warned me that if I was not able to find a solution for this difficult question of education, which would be acceptable to all classes, I might please my co-religionists, but that I could not please the public. While I am grateful to the writer of that

[1] Lecture given by Father Thomas N. Burke, the renowned Dominican preacher, in St. Peter's Church, Barclay Street, New York, on Thursday evening, May 23, 1872.

article, or to any one else that gives me advice, I have to tell you, and the writer of that notice, and everybody else, that I am not come to this country, nor have I put on this habit, to please either the public or my co-religionists, but to announce the truth of God, in the name of his holy Church. He who accepts it, and believes it, and acts upon it, shall be saved: he that does not choose to believe, Christ our Lord himself says, shall be condemned. God help us! God pity the people whose religious teachers have to try and please their co-religionists and the public! Great Lord! how terrible it is when the spirit of farce and of unreality finds its way even into the mind of the man who is to proclaim the truth by which alone his fellow-men and himself can be saved. But it was remarked, and truly, in the same article that "this is one of the most—perhaps the most—important questions of the day." No doubt it is. I don't suppose I could have a more important theme for the subject of my thoughts or of my words, than that of education. This is a question that comes home to every man among us. No man can close his mind against it. No man can shut it out from his thoughts. No man in the community can fold his arms and say, "This is a question which does not concern me, consequently upon which I am indifferent." No; and why? Because every man among us is obliged to live in society; that is to say, in intercommunion with his fellow-men. Every man's happiness or misery depends, in a large degree, upon the state of society in which he lives. If the associations that surround us are good and holy and pure; if our children are obedient, if our servants are honest, if our friends are loyal, and our neighbors are peaceable; if the persons who supply us with the necessaries of life are reliable—how far all these things go to smooth away the difficulties and annoyances and anxieties of life! And yet, all this depends mostly upon education. If, on the other hand, our children are rude, disobedient, and wilful; if those around us be dishonest, so that we must be constantly on our guard against them; if our friends be false, so that we know not upon whose word to rely; if everything we use and take to clothe ourselves be bad and adulterated or poisonous

—how miserable all this makes life![1] And yet these issues, I say again, depend mainly upon education. Therefore, it is a question that comes home to every man, and from which no man can excuse himself, or plead indifference or unconcern.

Now, first of all consider that the greatest misfortune that Almighty God can let fall upon any man is the curse of utter ignorance, or want of education. The Holy Ghost, in the Scriptures, expressly tells us that this absence of knowledge, this absence of instruction and education, is the greatest curse that can fall upon a man; because it not only unfits him for his duties to God, and for the fellowship of the elect of God, and for every Godlike and eternal purpose, but it also unfits him for the society of his human kind; and therefore, the Scripture says so emphatically: "Man, when he was in honor" (that is to say, created in honor), "lost his knowledge." He had no knowledge. What followed? He was compared to senseless beasts and made like to them. What is it that distinguishes man from the brute? Is it the strength of limb? No! Is it gracefulness of form? No! Is it acute sensations—a sense of superior sight, or a more intense and acute sense of hearing? No! In all these things many of the beasts that roam the forest exceed us. We have not the swiftness of the stag; we have not the strength of the lion; we have not the beautiful grace of the antelope of the desert; we have not the power to soar into the upper air, like the eagle, who lifts himself upon strong pinions and gazes on the sun. We have not the keen sense of sight of many animals, nor the keen sense of hearing of others. In what, then, lies the difference and the superiority of man? It lies in the intelligence, that can know, and the heart, which, guided by that intelligence, is influenced to love for intellectual motives, and in the will, which is supposed to preserve its freedom by acting under the dominion of that enlightened intellect and mind. For, mark you, it is not the mere power of knowing that distinguishes man from the brutes, and

[1] Every reading person knows Father Burke to have been a wise man and a great orator; but these words, in view of the conditions that surround us in America to-day, prove him to have been also, as wise men sometimes are, a great prophet.

brings him to the perfection of his nature. It is the actual presence of knowledge. It is not the mere power of loving that distinguishes man from the lower creatures. No. For if that love be excited by mere sensuality, by the mere appeal to the senses, it is not the high human love of man, but it is the mere lust of desire and passion of the brute. It is not the will that distinguishes man in the nobility of his nature from the brute; but it is the will, preserving its freedom, keeping itself free from the slavery and dominion of brute passions, answering quickly—heroically—to every dictate of the high and holy and enlightened intelligence that is in man. What follows from this? It follows that if you deprive him of intelligence or knowledge, if you leave him in utter ignorance and withdraw education, you thereby starve, and, as far as you can, annihilate the very highest portion of the soul of man; you thereby dwarf all his spiritual powers; you thereby leave that soul, which was created to grow, and to wax strong, and to be developed by knowledge—you leave it in the imbecility and the helplessness of its natural, intellectual, and spiritual infancy. What follows from this? It follows that the uneducated, uninstructed, ignorant, dwarfed individual is incapable of influencing the affections of the heart with any of the higher motives of love. It follows that if that heart of man is ever to love, it will not love upon the dictate of the intelligence, guiding it to an intellectual object; but, like the brute beast of the field, it will seek the gratification of all its desires upon the mere brutal, corporeal evidence of its senses. What follows moreover? It follows that the will which was created by the Almighty God in freedom, and which, by the very composition of man's nature, was destined to exercise that freedom under the dictate of intelligence, is now left without its proper ruler, an intelligent, instructed intellect; and, therefore, in the uninstructed man the allegiance of the will—and its dominion—is transferred to the passions, desires, depraved inclinations of man's lower nature. And so we see that in the purely and utterly uninstructed man there can be no loftiness of thought, no real purity of affection, nor can there be any real intellectual action of the will of man. Therefore, I

conclude that the greatest curse Almighty God can let fall upon a man is the curse of utter ignorance, unfitting him thereby for every purpose of God and every purpose of society.

First, then, I assert that want of education, or ignorance, unfits a man for his position, no matter how humble it be, in this world and in society. For all human society exists among men, and not among inferior animals, because of the existence in men of intelligence. All human society or intercourse is based upon intellectual communication, thought meeting thought; intellectual sympathy corresponding with the sympathy of others. But the man who is utterly uninstructed; the man who has never been taught to write or to read; the man who has never been taught to exercise any act of his intelligence; the poor neglected child that we see about our streets—growing up without receiving any word of instruction—grows up, rises to manhood, utterly unfit to communicate with his fellow-men, for he is utterly unprepared for that intercommunion of intelligence and intellect which is the function of society. What follows? He cannot be an obedient citizen, because he cannot even apprehend in his mind the idea of law. He cannot be a prosperous citizen, because he can never turn to any kind of labor which would require the slightest mental effort. In other words, he cannot labor as a man. He is condemned by his intellectual imbecility to labor merely with his hands. Mere brute force distinguishes his labor; and the moment you reduce a man to the degree and amount of mere corporeal strength, the moment you remove from his labor the application of intellect, that moment he is put in competition with the beasts, and they are stronger than he; therefore he is inferior to them. Take the utterly uninstructed man; he it is that is the enemy of society. He cannot meet his fellow-men in any kind of intellectual intercommunion. He is shut out from all that the past tells him in the history of the world; from all the high present interests that are pressing around him; from all his future he is shut out by his utter destitution of all religious education as well as civil. What follows from this? Isolated as he is—flung back upon his solitary self—no humanizing touch; no gentle impulse; no

softening remembrance even of sorrow or trouble; no aspiration for something better than the present moment; no remorse for sin; no consolation in pain; no relief in affliction; nothing of all this remains to him: an isolated, solitary man, such as you or I might be, if in one moment, by God's visitation, all that we have ever learned should be wiped out of our minds; all our past lost to us; all the hopes of the future cut off from us. Such is the ignorant man; and such society recognizes him to be. If there be a man who makes the state, and the government of the state, to tremble, it is the thoroughly uninstructed and uneducated man; it is the class neglected in early youth, and cast aside, and utterly uninstructed and undeveloped in their souls, in their hearts, and in their intellects. It is this class that, from time to time, comes to the surface in some wild revolution, swarming forth in the streets of London, or the streets of Paris, or in the streets of the great continental cities of Europe; swarming forth, no one knows from whence; coming forth from their cellars, coming forth from out the dark places of the city; with fury unreasoning in their eyes, and the cries of demons upon their lips. These are the men that have dyed their hands red in the best blood of Europe, whether it came from the throne or the altar. It is the thoroughly uninstructed, uneducated, neglected child of society that rises in God's vengeance against the world and the society that neglected him, and pays them back with bitter interest for the neglect of his soul in his early youth. Therefore it is that statesmen and philosophers cry out, in this our day, "We must educate the people!" And the great cry is Education. Quite true, and right!

And if the world demands education, much more does the Catholic Church. She is the true mother, not merely of the masses, as they are called, but of each and every individual soul among them. She it is to whose hands God has committed the eternal interests of man, and therefore it is with a zeal far greater than that of the world the Catholic Church applies herself to the subject and question of education. Why so? Because, if, as we have seen, all human society is based upon knowledge, upon intercom-

munion of intellect—of which the uninstructed man is incapable—the society which is called the Church—the supernatural and divine society—is also more emphatically founded upon the principles of knowledge. What is the foundation, the bond, the link, the life and soul of the Catholic Church. I answer—faith. Faith in God. Faith in every word that God has revealed. Faith, stronger than any human principle of belief, opinion, or conviction. Faith not only bowing down before God, but apprehending what God speaks; clasping that truth to the mind, and informing the intelligence with its light; admitting it as a moral influence into every action and every motive of a man's life. It is the soul and life of the Catholic Church. Faith. What is faith? It is an act of the intelligence, whereby we know and believe all that God has revealed. Faith, then, is knowledge? Most certainly! Is it an act of the will? No; not directly—not essentially—not immediately. It is directly, essentially, and immediately an act of the intellect, and not of the will. It is the intellect that is the subject wherein faith resides. The will may command that intellect to bow down and believe; but the essential act of faith is an act of the intelligence, receiving light and accepting it—and that light is knowledge; therefore, the Catholic Church cannot exist without knowledge.

More than this, the world has many duties which it imposes upon man, which require no education, little or nothing of instruction; for instance, the duty of labor, where one man, educated and instructed, taking his position at the head of the works or the engineering, is able to direct ten thousand men; there, among these ten thousand, no great amount of instruction or education is necessary or required; but the Catholic Church, on the other hand, imposes a great many tasks upon her children, every one of them requiring not only intellect, but highly trained and well-educated intellect. Look through the duties that the Church imposes upon us. Every one of these duties is intellectual. The Church commands us to pray. Prayer involves a knowledge of God, a knowledge of our own wants, and a knowledge how to elevate our souls to God; for prayer is the elevation of the soul; and the uninstructed soul cannot

elevate itself to the apprehension of a pure spiritual being. The Church commands us to prepare for confession. That involves a knowledge of the law of God, in order that we may examine ourselves, and see wherein we have failed; that involves a knowledge of ourselves, in order to study ourselves, that we may discover our sins. Preparation for confession involves a knowledge of God's claim to our love, in order that we may find motives for our sorrow. The Church commands us to approach the Holy Communion. That approach involves the high intellectual act whereby we are able with heart and with mind to realize the unseen, invisible, yet present God, and to receive him. We see the strong act of the intellect realizing the unseen, and transcending the evidence of the senses, so as to make that unseen, invisible presence act upon us more strongly—agitate us more violently—than the strongest emotion that the evidence of the senses can give.

The Church commands us to understand what her sacraments are; and that is a high intellectual act, whereby we recognize God's dealings with man through the agency of material things. In a word, every single duty the Catholic Church imposes is of the highest intellectual character.

Again: though the world demands knowledge and education as the very first element in its society, still the motive power that the world proposes to every man is self-interest; the appeal that the world makes, through the thousand channels through which it comes to us, is all an appeal to self. All the professions, all the mercantile operations, all the duties and pleasures of life—all appeal to the individual to seek his own self-aggrandizement—his own self-indulgence—to make life happy and pleasant to himself. Not so with the Church: her foundation is faith; and the motive she puts before every man is not self, but charity. Just as self concentrates the heart of man, narrows his intellectual and spiritual horizon, makes him turn in upon his own contracted being, and so narrows every intellectual and spiritual power within him; charity, on the other hand, which is the motive propounded by the Church, enlarges and expands the heart of man, enlarges the horizon of his

intellectual view, and lifts him up above himself. Like a man climbing the mountain-side, every foot that he ascends he sees the horizon enlarging and winding around him. So, also, every Catholic, the more he enters into the spirit of his holy religion, the more does he perceive the intellectual, moral, and spiritual horizon enlarging—taking in more interests and manifesting more beauties of a spiritual order. So it is with the Church of God. She depends more upon education than even the world, both from the fundamental principle of faith, which is an act of the intellect, and the motive of action, which is charity, which is an expansion of the intellect, and also from the nature of the duties which she imposes upon her children, and which are all of the highest intellectual character. And yet, strange to say, among the many oddities of this age of ours, there is a singular delusion which has taken hold of the Protestant mind, that the Catholic Church is opposed to education; that she is anxious to keep the people ignorant; that she is afraid to let them read; that she does not like to see schools opened, and that she is afraid of enlightenment. They argue so blindly and yet so complacently that when you find a good-natured and good-humored Protestant man or woman calmly talking about these things, it is difficult to keep from laughing; it is easy enough to keep your temper, but very hard to keep from laughing. For instance, talking about Spain or Mexico; calmly and complacently telling how the whole country is to become Protestant as soon as the whole people "learn how to read, you know!" and "begin to reason, you know!" "If we can only get good schools among them." Then they believe the infernal lies told them; for instance, the lie is told that, in Rome, since Victor Emmanuel entered it, thirty-six schools have been opened—taking it for granted there were no schools there before! I lived twelve years in Rome, under the Pope, and there was a school almost in every street; not a child in Rome was uneducated; nay, more—the Christian brothers and the nuns went out in the streets of Rome regularly, every morning, and went from house to house, and upstairs in the tenement-houses, among the poor people, picking up the children; or if they found

a little boy running about in the streets, he was taken quietly to school. They went out regularly to pick up the children out of the streets; and yet these men who are interested in blinding the foolish Protestant mind, come with such language as this—for it is the popular idea, which they wish to perpetuate, that the Catholic Church is afraid of education. No, my friends, the Catholic Church is afraid of one man more than any other, and that is the ignorant man. The man who brings disgrace upon his religion is the thoroughly ignorant man, if he is a professed Catholic; and the man impossible to make a Catholic of is the thoroughly ignorant Protestant. The more ignorant he is, the less chance there is of making a Catholic of him. The truth is, in this day of ours the great conversions made to the Catholic Church in this country and Europe, from Protestantism, all take place among the most enlightened and highly educated and cultivated people. Why? Because the more the Protestant reads, and the more he knows, the nearer he approaches to the Catholic Church, the true fountain-head and source of education. Why is this accusation brought against the Catholic Church, that she is afraid of this and afraid of that? I will tell you why. Because she insists, in the teeth of the world, and in spite of the world's pride and ignorance and bloated self-sufficiency—the Catholic Church insists, as she has insisted for eighteen hundred and seventy-two years,[1] " I know how to teach; you don't; you must come to me; you cannot live without me. Don't imagine you can live by yourselves, or you will fall back into the slough of your own impurity and corruption." The world does not like to hear this. The Catholic Church insists that she alone understands what education means. The world does not like to hear that. But I come here to-night to prove it, not only to you, my co-religionists, but if there be one here who is not a Catholic, to him also, and so to please the public if they choose to be pleased; but if my co-religionists or the public choose to be displeased, the truth is there personified in the Church, and that truth

[1] Father Burke is speaking in 1872, but his striking words apply with even greater force to Godless educational conditions in this year of our Lord 1906.

will remain after the co-religionists and the indignant public are all swept away.

There are three systems of education that are before us in this country. There are three classes of men who are talking about education; namely, those who go for what is called a thoroughly secular system; those who go for a denominational system, as far as it is Protestant; and the Catholic, who goes in for Catholic education. Let us examine the three. There is a large class in England and in America who assume the tone of the philosopher, and who, with great moral dignity and infinite presumption, lay down the law for their neighbors, and tell them: "There is no use quarrelling, my dear Baptists and Methodists, and you pestering Catholics; on the other hand, you want your schools—every one wants their own school; let us adopt a beautiful system of education that will take in every one, and leave your religious differences among yourselves; let us do away with religion altogether. The child has to be taught a great deal independent of religion. There is history, philosophy, geography, geology, engineering, steam-works; all these things can be taught without any reference to God at all. So let us do this; let us adopt non-sectarian education." Now, these are two big words: non-sectarian—a word of five syllables—and education; nine syllables altogether. Now, when people adopt great, big words, in this way, you should always be on your guard against them; because if I wanted to palm off something not true, I would not set it out in plain English, but try to involve it in big words; for, as the man in the story says, "If it is not sense, at least it is Greek." So, these two words, non-sectarian education, if you wish to know what they mean, turn them into English. Non-sectarian education, in good old Saxon English, means teaching without God: five syllables. Teaching your children, fathers and mothers, and educating them without God! Not a word about God, no more than if God did not exist! He can be spoken of in the family; he may be preached in the temple, or in the church; but there is one establishment in the land where God must not come in; where God must not be mentioned—and that establishment is the

place where the young are to receive the education that is to determine their life, both for time and eternity; the place where the young are to receive that education upon which eternity depends. The question of heaven or hell, for every child there, depends upon that education, and that education must be given without one mention of the name of the God of Heaven!

Try to let it enter into your minds what this amiable system is. This beautiful system is founded upon two principles, which lie at the bottom of it; namely: The first principle is, that man can attain perfection without the aid of Jesus Christ at all. This system of education does not believe in Christ. It is the Masonic principle; the principle of the Freemasons over again; namely: that God has made us so that without any help from him at all, without any shadow of grace, or sacrament, or religion, we can work out perfection in ourselves; therefore, we are independent of God. It is the last result of human pride; and hence the secular education which does not take cognizance of God says we can bring up these children to be what they ought to be without teaching them anything about God. The second principle upon which it is based is, that the end of human life, under the Christian dispensation, is not what Christ our Lord, or St. Paul, supposed it to be, but something else. The Scriptures declare that the end of the Christian's purposes in this life should be to incorporate himself with the Lord Jesus Christ, and to grow into the fullness of his age and his manhood in Christ; to put on the Lord—the unity, the love, the generosity and every virtue of our Divine Lord and Saviour. This is to be the end of the Christian man, the purpose of his life, on which all depends. Now, these principles are expressly denied on the part of those who teach without God. Can they teach without God—the Almighty God, who has them in the hollow of his hand? The principle is absurd in itself. To teach human sciences without God is an impossibility. For instance, can you teach history without God? The very first passage of history says: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"; and, therefore, in this system of education, the professor of history, the teacher, must say:

"My dear children, I am going to teach you history; but I must not begin at the beginning; for there we find God, and he is not allowed in the school!" Can you teach philosophy without God? Philosophy is defined to be the pursuit after wisdom. It is the science that traces effects to their causes; and the philosopher proceeds from the existence of the First Cause; and that First Cause is God; therefore the philosophy that excludes God must begin with the second cause: just as if a man wanted to teach a little boy how to cast up sums, and he said, "We will begin with number two; there is no number one." The child would turn round and say, "Is not number two a multiplication of number one? How can there be a number two unless there is a number one to be multiplied?" Can a man teach the alphabet and leave out the first letter, A, and say, Let us begin with the letter B? Such is the attempt to teach philosophy or history without God. Can they teach geology without God? Can they exclude from their disquisitions upon the earth, and the earth's surface, and the soil of the earth—can they exclude the Creator's hand? They attempt to do it; but in their very attempt they preach their infidelity. Hence, no man can teach geology without being either a profound and pious believer in revelation, or an avowed and open infidel. In a word, not one of these human sciences is there that does not, in its ultimate result and analysis, fall back upon the First Truth—the fountain of all truth—the cause of all certainty—and that is God.

But, putting all these considerations aside, let us suppose we gave our children to these men to instruct them. They say, the parents can teach at home any form of religion they like. Let us suppose we give our children to the instruction of these men. Do they know how to educate them? They don't know what the word "education" means. What does it mean? It means, in its very etymology, to bring forth, to develop, to bring out what is in the mind. That little child of seven years is the father of the man. It is only seven years of age, but it is the father of the man that will be in twenty years' time. Now, to educate and bring out in that child every faculty, every power of his soul, that he will require

for the exercise of his manhood to-morrow—that is the true meaning of the word "education." In the human soul there are two distinct systems of powers, both necessary for the man, both acting upon and influencing his life. First of all is the intelligence of a man; he must receive education. But there is, together with that pure intellect or intelligence—there is the heart that must also be educated; there are the affections; there is the will; and as knowledge is necessary for the intellect, divine grace is necessary for the heart and for the will. If you give to your child every form of human knowledge, and pour into him ideas in abundance, and develop and bring forth every faculty of his intellect, and let nothing be hid from him in the way of knowledge, but do not mind his heart, and do not educate his spirit and affections—how is he to subdue his passions? Do not speak to him of his moral duties, which are to be the sinews of his life, and do not attempt at all to strengthen and teach the will to bow to the intellect; do not speak to him of his duties, nor the things that he must practise—what will you have at the end of the education? An intellectual monster. Fancy a little child five or six years old. Suppose all the growth was turned into his head, and the rest of his body remained fixed; in a few years you would have a monster; you would have a little child with the head of a giant upon him. Don't attempt to purify the affections, and you will develop, indeed, the intellect, but the other powers will be in such disproportion that you have made an intellectual monster. You have made something worse: you have made a moral monster. It is quite true, knowledge is power. But all power in creation requires restraint in order to be useful. Without such restraint, it is hurtful and destructive. The horse will serve you only as long as you can keep him in hand with bit and bridle. The locomotive is useful only as long as the engineer's hand controls it. The lightning, which, unrestrained, would destroy you, becomes the messenger of your thoughts when guided and restrained by the electric wire. You have given that man power by giving him knowledge. But you have not given him a single principle to purify and influence or restrain that power, so as to use it properly. Therefore

you have made a moral monster. And now that man is all the more wicked, and all the more heartless, and all the more remorseless and impure, in precisely the same proportion as you succeed in making him cultured and learned. This is the issue of this far-famed system of non-sectarian education.

There is another system of education, and it is that of our separated brethren in this land, who say that they are quite as indignant as we are, and as horrified at the idea of an utterly Godless education; that they do not go in for a Godless education; on the contrary, they mean to have God everywhere. They are trying now to put him in the American Constitution, if they can succeed. They also build their schools; and they think that Catholics are the most unreasonable people in the world because we do not consent to send our children to them. They say, "What objection can you have to the Bible? Don't you believe in it as well as we do?" They say, "Cannot you send your children to us on the platform of our common Christianity? There are a great many things that we believe together." They say, "We will not ask to teach the children one iota against the Catholic worship; nor ask them to participate in any religious teaching, only as far as they hold that general truth in common with our Protestant children." So they ask us to stand with them on the platform of common Christianity? Well, a great many Catholics are taken by this, and think it is very unreasonable, and that it is almost bigotry, in the Catholic Church to refuse it. Well, let us but examine what the platform of our common Christianity allows. What does it mean? Here is a Protestant school carried out on Protestant principles. Let us suppose that they shut up the Protestant Bible, and put it aside, but carry on the school on Protestant principles as far as they go in common with the Catholic faith; the Catholic is invited to share the school with them. First of all, how far do we go together? I don't know if there be any Protestant here; if there is, I don't wish to say a harsh, disrespectful, or unpleasant word; but let us consider how far we can go together—the Protestants and the Catholics. Well, they answer first of all, "We believe in the exist-

ence of God." Thanks be to God, we do!—the Protestants and the Catholics are united on that; both believe there is a God above us. The next great dogma of Christianity is, "We believe in the Divinity of Christ." Stop, my friends! I am afraid we must shake hands and part. I am afraid the platform of our common Christianity is too narrow. Are you aware that it is not necessary for a Protestant to believe in the Divinity of Jesus Christ? A great many Protestants do believe it, most piously and most fervently; a great many Protestants believe in it as we do. It is most emphatically true, however, that there are clergymen of the Church of England preaching in Protestant churches throughout England, who deny the Divinity of Jesus Christ; and it is emphatically true that at this very moment the whole Protestant world is trying to get rid of the Athanasian Creed, because that creed says, whoever does not believe in the Divinity of Jesus Christ cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Therefore, I must fling back this assertion. I cannot grant it. I wish to God I could! No; if, to-morrow, the Anglican clergy who have written against the Divinity of our Lord, and against the inspiration of the Scriptures, and against all forms of religion, in works that are printed, asking all the pious Protestants of England to believe in their ideas—professors of England enjoying their yearly salaries; preaching religion (God save the mark!)—if one of these men were to appear on trial to-morrow, the Queen[1] and her Council would decide that the Divinity of Christ is not a necessary doctrine. You go one step beyond the existence of God, and the platform is overthrown; and the Catholic and the Protestant child can no longer stand side by side. Into that Protestant school goes a Protestant child to be taught his religion. Everything that his religion requires him to believe he is taught; but the Catholic child, before he can go in to receive his instruction, must leave behind him, outside the door, his belief in the Sacraments, Confession, the Holy Communion, prayers for the dead, the Blessed Virgin, all the saints, the duty of self-examination and of prayer; in a word, all the specific duties, all

[1] The late Queen Victoria.

the principles, of the Catholic religion must be forgotten and ignored by that Catholic child before he can come down low enough to take a seat on the platform with his little Protestant brother. Is it any wonder that we should not like to do it? If you should live in a beautiful house, well furnished, with every convenience, and your neighbor was living in a damp cellar, where it was cold and dark; and if he asked you to come down and live with him, you would answer, "I am much obliged, my dear friend, but I prefer not." If you had a good dinner of roast beef, and your neighbor had only a salt herring; and he requested you to eat with him, you would answer, "No, I can't do it." And so, when they ask us to come down from the heights of our Catholic knowledge, to go out of the atmosphere of the sacraments and of the divine presence of Jesus Christ, the atmosphere of responsibility to God, realized and asserted in confession and communion; and from the intercessory prayer of Mary, the Mother of Jesus Christ, and of the saints; and ask us to forget our dead, ask us to give up everything that a Catholic holds dear, that we may have the privilege of standing upon the miserable platform of "our common Christianity" with our Protestant brethren—we must say that we are much obliged to them, but beg to decline their offer. I say it is a meagre meal that they offer us; but inasmuch as we have something a great deal better and more luxurious at home, we beg leave to be excused; and if they choose to come to us, let them step up to our Catholic schools and find all that they can find in their Protestant schools and a great deal more; but if they choose not to do it, we cannot help it, we cannot go down to them—never! Now, on the principle of Catholic education, the Catholic Church says: "I know how to educate; there is no single power in that child's soul, not a single faculty, either intellectual, moral, or spiritual, that I will not bring forth into its full bloom. That child requires knowledge for its intelligence; and every form of human knowledge; so that we can compete with every other teacher in the world." This the Church provides, so that she fears no competition, but can hold her own in every branch of secular education. Some time ago there was a

commission issued by the British Government, to examine the schools of Ireland. They thought to convict our Catholic schools of inefficiency; at least they thought that we paid so much attention to religion that we did not give the children enough secular knowledge. Their commissioners went through the land, and solemnly reported in the House of Commons that they found that no schools in Ireland imparted so much secular knowledge as the Christian Brothers' and the Nuns'. They had to say it. The teachers in the other schools declared that secular knowledge was their first object, and religion, if admitted at all, a secondary thing. The Christian Brothers said, religion first, and secular knowledge afterward. The other schools admitted a miserable modicum of religion in order to induce the child to receive secular education; but the Christian Brothers admitted secular knowledge in order to induce in the child's heart and soul religion. And yet, in the rivalry, the Catholic Church was so completely ahead—even in imparting secular knowledge—that our enemies, on this question of secular education, were obliged to acknowledge that there is nothing at all in Ireland like the schools of the Christian Brothers and of the Nuns.

The Church says: "Let no fountain of human knowledge be denied. Let every light which human knowledge and science can bring be thrown upon that intelligence. I am not afraid of it. I desire that the child may have intelligence; the more I can flood that intellect with the light, the better guarantee I have that the man will be a true and fervent, because an eminently intellectual, Catholic." But the Church adds: "That child's heart requires to be instructed; that child's affections require to be directed; that child's passions must be purified; that child must be made familiar with the things and joys of heaven before he becomes familiar with the sights and joys of earth." Therefore she takes the child, before he comes to the age of reason, and makes his young eyes to be captivated with the images and sweetness and spiritual beauties of Jesus and Mary; and draws, and makes that young heart full of love for the Redeemer before the appeal of passion excites the earthly love; before the mystery of iniquity that is in the world

"OF SUCH IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN"

FROM THE PAINTING BY BENJAMIN WEST, R.A.

is revealed to his reason. Therefore she draws that child, and familiarizes his mind with the words of faith, and the language of heaven and prayer; intermingling with his amusements and studies an element of devotion and of religion. Because she recognizes that as much as the world stands in need of intellectual men, far, far more does it stand in need of honest men, pure men, high-minded men. Because she knows, if knowledge is not intermingled with grace, that knowledge without grace becomes a curse instead of a blessing. It was the curse of the world that it was so intellectual in the era of Augustus, because, says St. Paul, " They refused to admit God into their knowledge; and God gave them up to a reprobate sense." What follows? Every faculty of the mind, of the affections, as well as of the intellect, is brought out in that child; so that the whole soul is developed, and has fair play, and is brought forth, under the system of Catholic education.

Which of these three systems, think you, is the most necessary for the world? I was asked to please the public as well as my co-religionists. I wish to God I could please the public with such a doctrine as this, and propound the truth; and say to the public, to every father and mother in America, Protestant and Catholic—when God gave you that child, it was only that, by your action and by your education, that child might grow into the resemblance of Jesus Christ; it was only that Christ, the Son of God, might be multiplied in men, that men are born at all! What do you imagine we came into this world for? To become rich? It is hard for the rich man to be saved! To become great and wondrous before the world's eyes? Oh, this greatness is like the mist which the rays of the morning sun dispel. No! God made us for eternity; and now eternity depends upon our bringing out in our hearts, in our affections, in the interest and harmony of our lives, in the simple faith and belief of our souls, in every highest virtue—bringing out within us and clothing ourselves with the Lord Jesus Christ. And now I ask again, which of the three systems of education is likely to do this? Would to God that I could please the public of America when I preach Jesus Christ, and him alone! Now, surely it is to

our schools that we can apply his word who said, " Suffer the little children to come unto me." And if the public are not pleased when they hear his name, when they hear how they are to implant him in their children's lives—all I can do is to pray for the public, that Almighty God may open their blind eyes, and let the pure light into their darkened intellects.

I know that it is hard upon the Catholics of the country to be constantly called upon to build one set of schools for Catholics, and to be obliged, as citizens, to build another set, and furnish them, for persons wealthier or better off than themselves. It is a hardship; and I don't think the state—with great respect to the authorities—ought to call upon you to do it. But still, great as the hardship is, when you consider that your children receive in the Catholic schools what they cannot receive elsewhere; when you consider that your own hopes for heaven are bound up in these children, and that the education they need they can receive only in the Catholic school, and nowhere else—you must put up with this disadvantage, and make this sacrifice, among many others, to gain heaven. For it is written, " The kingdom of heaven suffers violence, and the violent shall bear it away."

CHAPTER XXIV

CATHOLICITY NOT THE DANGER, BUT THE SAFETY OF THE GREAT AMERICAN REPUBLIC [1]

The American nation yet in its youth—Its amazing material and intellectual growth—Great questions not yet decided—Religion the vital principle of the people's life—America looking for the truth—Bound to become Catholic—Strength in unity—Patriotism, or love of country—Religious union—What it stands for—The immutable principle of eternal responsibility—Evils of manifold forms of religious worship—The principles of Catholicity—The Church's divine commission and guarantee—Jesus Christ in the Blessed Eucharist—Political freedom and religious unity of Catholics—Failure of the religion of private judgment—*Ego sum lux mundi!* ("I am the light of the world!")—The principle of disunion in Protestantism—Revealed truth often transcends the human mind—From religious disunion spring social and political dissensions—Historical truths of the Catholic Church—Her great work in behalf of morality and good citizenship—The inviolable sanctity of the marriage-tie—How the Church protects the wife—No Catholic can separate a mother from her children—Divorce rending modern society, as Samson rent the temple of the Philistines—The Catholic Church alone upholds the falling edifice—Protector of the home—Future of America must be Catholic—No slavery in Catholicity—To accept the truth and be incapable of contradicting it is the supremacy of liberty—"You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"—Difference between Catholicity and Protestantism illustrated—The Catholic faith the highest form of intellectual freedom—The Catholic priesthood—"Blessed are the poor in spirit"—The Catholic Church the stanch friend of republics—Her appeal is always to the people—The great, generous heart of America—The crowning grace of unity of faith and sacramental sanctity—Ancient despotisms will do homage to magnificent Columbia.

ADDRESSING, as I have the honor to do, an audience of American ladies and gentlemen, I must begin by reminding you that you are a young nation; that when you compare your age with that of other peoples and nations, you are as but an infant in swaddling-clothes, while other nations are decrepit old men. Ireland was converted to Christianity more than one thousand years before Christopher Columbus was born. This will

[1] Address delivered by Father Thomas N. Burke, O.P., in St. Mary's Church, Perth Amboy, New Jersey, November 7, 1872.

give you some idea of the respective ages of nations and of empires. Being thus young, two things must strike the observant and attentive mind in looking at America. First, the thinking man is simply struck dumb with amazement in the face of so much material and intellectual greatness, the fruit of so few years. You are a nation but of yesterday; yet you have outstripped the oldest races and nations upon the earth in the march of civilization, in the cultivation of the sciences and the arts. You are but a nation of yesterday, and yet the oldest and the most civilized peoples on the face of the earth not only take from you examples of government, models of machinery, but even upon great moral and historical questions they send their best, and their most enlightened, and their most learned sons to make an appeal to the intelligence of America and vindicate the actions of centuries long gone by.

The second thing that must strike the attentive mind, contemplating this land, is that, great as the progress has been, wonderful as the intellectual and material development is, there are still questions, the deepest, the greatest, the most vital that can affect the life and the future of any people, that are not yet decided in America. Among these, I hold that the very greatest is the question of religion. There lies the vital principle of the source of the people's life; there lies the great secret of their strength, of their energy, of their united action; there lies the secret of that spiritual life which must be in a people before they can become really great. For it is not mere material prosperity, and breadth of material domain, or mineral resources, or might in arms, that make the true life of a people. These are the adornments of the life of a people. But the real life of a people, like the life of a man, is the spiritual life—the moral life that is within them—and this depends entirely upon that people's religion. Is this great religious question settled in America for ever and for aye? I was greatly struck two or three months ago, on reading an article in a very clever and well-conducted New York paper, which described the various preachers and orators around that city, the multitude of varying doctrines that they taught, the contradictions that one gave

to the other, and then it said: "In the midst of this hubbub of religious controversy, America goes from one man to another, looking for the truth." The question, then, is not settled; and the highest intelligence of America admits that this land is yet to choose its religion.

Now, I am a Catholic priest; and, naturally and professionally, I speak from out of the convictions of my mind and my heart, of what is called the Catholic religion; and I assert that America is bound to become Catholic, and that Catholicity never will be a danger, but a true safety—a certain source of greatness—to this mighty land. First of all, I hold that the Catholic religion will be the true safety of America. Secondly, I will endeavor to prove the assertion, that it cannot by any possibility be a source of danger or of weakness to this land.

What is the first element of the salvation of a people? What is the first great element of a people's strength? I answer, it is *unity*. You remember the familiar old adage, "Union is strength." You know that the Almighty God in heaven is omnipotence itself. And why? Because he is unity itself. You know that power always goes hand in hand with unity. You know how jealously the nations endeavor to keep their component elements together, and how fond they are, in cases of federal or internal importance, of saying, "*Quis separabit?*"—"Who shall break us up or disunite us?" Union is strength; disunion, weakness. I need not give you the history of the land that bore me, whose history I know better than that of any other people. There I find a people disunited upon every question except one; and on that one question they were united; upon that one question they agreed; and that was the question of Ireland's Catholicity. The finger of England was able to erase the name of Ireland from the list of the nations, because Ireland, as a nation, was disunited. The right hand of England, battling for three hundred years, has been paralyzed, unable to shake or to destroy Ireland's Catholicity, because on the question of religion England encountered a united people. When, therefore, we come to consider the real safety and greatness of a nation,

the very first thing to find out is some common principle upon which you can really unite.

It is upon the principle of patriotism or love of country that states are founded. If you have no rallying-point; if you have no idea upon which you can gather up all the scattered elements of the nation, and unite them in unity of thought and love, you have not even the elements of a people. Among those grand ideas upon which a nation rests, making millions and, perhaps, hundreds of millions united as one man, what is the strongest principle represented? I answer, it is the religious principle. Religion—a common religion professed by *all*—that is the strongest central point of unity that God or man can establish in the heart of a nation. Why do I say this? First of all, because if you take any other one point upon which you seek to unite a people, you will find that it cannot be compared to the unity of religious thought. Let us suppose that they are united upon some grand political platform; the circumstances of to-morrow or the next day may shake the minds of many; the circumstances may so change that what was patriotism and sound policy to-day, may become the ruin of the nation to-morrow. Weak minds are shaken; they are divided; they go off into a thousand forms of political belief, with the changing circumstances of the year. "A man should stand to his principles," you say. Certainly; and be firm and unchangeable in them; but remember that the greatest enemy the state ever had is a man who does not know how to adapt his conduct, to shape his political action, by the exigencies of the circumstances of the day.

Take any other principle upon which you seek to unite a people, and you have the elements of discord and dissension in the very heart of it, just as the tint that comes in autumn lies in the heart of the rose when it opens in the spring and in the summer of the year. There is only one principle that will never change, that remains the same for ever and ever, to which men can always go, upon which they can always fall back as upon a certain rallying-point that will never be wanting to them; like the rock against which the Roman of old planted himself and with heroic hand

swept his enemies before him, because the rock was behind him to protect him. This one principle is the principle of religious union. It represents God; it represents conscience; it represents the affirmation of the will; it represents a man's hopes for the eternity that lies before him. These are things that do not change from the circumstances of the hour; and the unity that springs from them is like the unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in heaven; it is a unity that can never be dissevered or broken, but must remain the same forever.

The second reason why religious unity is the strongest point that can unite a people is, that on no other principle can you unite them so as to make that principle a guarantee of their conduct and their lives. A man may belong to a political party. When the time comes for action, he may get sulky and decline to act with the party, and say, "I will not vote at this election; I will not make a speech; I will not use my influence among my fellow-citizens; I will not tell them what my sentiments are." And his friends say, "He is wanting to us in the very hour of our danger." Again, a man may be subject to influences that will oblige him to draw back, and to refuse to act with his party. Unite men on any principle that you will, you are never sure of their acting up to that principle until you put the hand of God upon their conscience; until you enclose in that religious grasp all their future hopes; until you establish in their minds the immutable principle of eternal responsibility for thought, word, and act. Then, and only then, have you a guarantee that in the hour of difficulty, of trial, and of danger your man will be up to the mark, because he will be afraid of God if he is not.

Now, where, I ask you, is this great Republic of America to find the element of unity which will be the secret of her mighty power and strength in time to come, if she refuses to become Catholic? Where is it? Some years ago, a very learned and distinguished Englishman, a public lecturer, congratulated the English people upon the multitude of different churches and sects that were in the land. He said: "I see, in the small country town, the Meth-

odist preaching-house, the Baptist conventicle, the Quaker's modest, humble meeting-house, the old village church, with its tower and its peal of bells, the Catholic church, with its cross and its images around. I rejoice," he said, " for the multitude of these, and the multiplication of them shows how deep is the religious principle in the English mind, and how fruitful it is in manifold forms of religious worship." Now, he embodied the very first principle of Protestantism in that remark.

Remember that there are two principles upon which all religion is based; namely, the principle of authority and the principle of a man's own reason and judgment. Every religion that exists appeals either to one or the other of these. Every religion either says to man: " Be as a little child, submit your intelligence, be content to be taught; when you acknowledge the logical necessity of an authoritative voice to teach you, then take the word and obey it." Or it says to him, " I have no authority; you have authority; your own judgment, your own reason is the last, the ultimate tribunal to which I can make my appeal; and whatever decision your own individual judgment comes to, let that be the corner-stone and foundation of your personal belief." It is one or the other of these two. One is the principle of Catholicity, namely, the voice coming with a divine commission, and saying, " Here I am, here is my diploma; if you believe the Scripture, see what it says of me; it says of me that the gates of hell shall never prevail against me. It says that the Spirit of Truth has come upon me to remain and to wrap me in the truth forever. It says of me that the Son of God himself declared that he would be with me all days unto the consummation of the world; and it also says of me that I received from the lips of the incarnate God the command and the commission to go forth and to teach all nations. It says, moreover, of me that, when I lift up my voice to teach the nations, he that will not hear that voice is, in the sight of the Son of God, a heathen and a publican." These are the words of Scripture; these are the principles upon which Catholicity is based.

Now, as to the authority. That is one and only one, and that

one principle of authority is a divine commission and a divine guarantee that no falsehood can ever enter into the burden of the Church's teaching. Therefore, that teaching must create unity. And, in fact, ask the first Catholic man that you meet any question touching the faith; he will answer you; and it is not he that answers, but it is two hundred millions of Catholics the world over that speak in his voice. Ask the first Catholic child that you meet —" Is Christ present in the Blessed Eucharist?" And with the voice of two hundred millions speaking as from one man, he will answer, " Yes, he is there as truly as he is at the right hand of the Father in heaven."

On other questions we are broken up. Where is there a class of people more disunited than we Catholics are on every question? Every man has perfect liberty. I may be, at home in Ireland, a Whig or a Tory, and you may be here a Republican, or Liberal-Republican, or Democrat. Every man is at liberty. We are broken up into national sections, and there is a great deal of national antipathy; and Catholics in Ireland have no great liking for Catholics in England. The French that were fighting last year, and the Bavarians that were fighting against them,[1] were both Catholics; and there they were, putting each other to death. Divided by national interests, or philosophic and historic ideas, as we are, the moment we fall back upon religion every solitary Catholic in the world, that knows his religion, represents two hundred millions in the world. In other words, there is a perfect unity of thought, of faith, and practice in religion. How grand is this! Is there anything like it in the world? What is the religion that revolted against the Catholic Church and refused to adopt this principle? It is an appeal made to the private judgment and the personal intelligence of every man. Now, I am going to say a strong thing. I shall defy any man living to find for me in the Scriptures, from the first chapter in Genesis to the last chapter in the Apocalypse, one sentence in which Almighty God can be proved to have said that the private judgment of man is to be the standard of his

[1] Father Burke here refers to the Franco-German War of 1870–71.

religion. Everywhere it is authority. In the Old Testament it is: "Thus saith the Lord." This was the word on the lips of every prophet: "Hear, O Israel; thus saith the Lord of Hosts." In the New Testament it is the same. It is still authority; it is authority everywhere. "Whatever the Father hath told me, that I have told you," says Christ to his apostles. "As the Father sent me with power, so do I send you." "I am the light of the world—*Ego sum lux mundi.* Ye also are the salt of the earth." So do we find that nowhere in the Scriptures is the fallible, changeable judgment or reason of man made to be the standard of divine truth.

Now, the principle on which every religion, outside of the Catholic Church, is based, is that changeable standard. Here is a book, the Bible—the most difficult book that ever was printed; a book which in itself tells us that the unwary and unstable will pervert it to their own destruction. Take this book and find your religion in it, and whatever interpretation you put upon these given passages—those truths which have puzzled so many theologians and philosophers—that is to be your religion! What follows from this? As many religions as there are minds to interpret the written word of the Bible without a guide.

I remember once a poor man in Ireland saying to me: "Your Reverence, tell me how many different religions are there outside of the Catholic Church?" "Well," I said, "I don't know, but I imagine there must be nearly a hundred different forms of Protestantism." "Is that all, sir?" said he. "Well, that beats me completely. Your Reverence, I always thought that there ought to be a distinct form of Protestant religion for every single man that read the Bible and professed to interpret it." And he was right.

Do you not perceive at once that there is the principle of disunion? To multiply religious tests, to multiply religious tribunals, according to the judgment of each man, is the very principle upon which Protestantism, in the widest sense, rests. I grant you that at first sight it seems eminently intellectual. I am not a bigot. I grant you that at first sight it seems the grandest act of homage

that was ever paid to the intellect of man, to put into his hands the most difficult documents that have come down upon the stream of time, and to say: "You are able to interpret them; do it." But I hold that in the day that that word was said to human intelligence, there was a duty imposed upon the intellect of man to which that intellect was totally unequal. There was a load put upon the mind of man that no human mind unaided can bear. God has given us intelligence—extensive, profound, clear, and intuitive—for natural truths; and in this horizon of natural truths—embracing all the sciences, all the arts—the mind of man is at home, is performing its own functions in disputing about all these things, and following out the grain of historic or scientific truth. But the moment it is a question of revealed truth that transcends the human mind; the moment it is a question of knowing the truth, not of the things of earth, but of those things that eye hath not seen nor hath ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive—that moment, if God does not come to the rescue, by revelation and by authority, the human mind will make as great a failure as if you called upon a man born blind to give you a description of the rising sun.

Now, one or the other of these two principles lies before America. In one—namely, in Catholicity—this mighty nation finds one grand, magnificent, and vast principle of unity, which means strength. In the other, upon the most vital question of religion the people are divided. It is a strange and significant fact that out of that religious disunion spring disunion and dissension upon every social and political question almost in our daily life. Who can doubt it? Are there not Irish Protestants, for instance, celebrating the "Battle of the Boyne," in which Irish blood was spilled, and because of which the Irish Catholic that day was weeping? It is a political and historical question. Why, then, do these two men of the same race and blood take such widely different views upon it; one exulting, the other weeping? Because one is a Catholic, and the other a Protestant. Why, on the anniversary of St. Patrick's day—because Ireland first saw light through him—why

do Irish Catholics parade with cannons and drums, and sometimes, perhaps, making too much noise—while another class of Irishmen would be only too happy to be let out with guns and revolvers to fire at the procession? Is it not a great fact that this man came and evangelized us? Then, why do men take such different views of a historic fact? Because one is a Protestant, and the other is a Catholic. And if the principle of Protestantism is to become the grand principle of religion in America, then in this mighty land the effort of the patriot, the grand designs of the statesman, the conflict of the warriors, will be marred, neutralized, ruined, by the principle of dissension that lies at the very source of the spiritual life of the people.

Even at this day, if any line of imperial policy is marked out for America, or for England, or for Germany, or for any other divided country, half Protestant and half Catholic; if any line of policy is marked out, in which, if the nation had the courage to strike out boldly and fearlessly, great emoluments would be the result, the first thing a statesman says is, How will the Catholic view it, and how will the Protestant view it? What support am I to command from one and from the other? Do not the cabinets in those divided countries constantly lament with the English statesman who said: "The real difficulty in my position as Premier of England is that I have no will over a people who are antagonistic on every question because they are divided on religion." Think you, gentlemen, that the keen, shrewd, high, clear, intelligence of America is going to commit itself forever and forever to such an anomaly as this? No. These dissensions and religious divisions have always been brought forward in seasons of trouble, when men did not reason, but allowed their passions to overcome them. America reasons well, reasons shrewdly; and all that the Catholic Church has to do is to manifest her historical truths, and bring home to the conviction and intelligence of this mighty land the reasonableness of her devotion, the grandeur and logic of her faith; and, as sure as God gave America that mind which is his gift, so sure will the day come, and soon come, when the magnificent garb of religious

unity and of Catholic faith shall fall upon the imperial shoulders of America.

Secondly, "Catholicity is the safety of the great Republic," when we reflect that, next to a strong, abiding, unchangeable principle of unity, the great secret of a people's life and strength and safety is some agency, some organization or other, that will bring honesty and morality home to every man in the land—not only with the command of a precept, but also with a penalty for their transgression. Remember that we are so constituted that although we may see a thing in its proper light, may acknowledge its just weight, yet we fail of acting according to our convictions because of our weakness, because of our inherent misery. How few men there are in this world whose actions and whose daily life correspond with their theories and ideas of what is right and what is wrong! Is there a man among us that can kneel down at the close of any day of his life, and question himself before his God and before his conscience: "Have I to-day—in every thought, word, and act of my life—have I lived up to my conviction and knowledge of what is right and what is wrong?" There is scarcely a man among us that will not be obliged to say, every day of his life: "I have been wanting in more things than one." Is it want of knowledge of what is right or wrong? No. It is from want of a sufficient pressure put upon us. The right must be forced upon us; the wrong must come before us, not only as a thing that is forbidden, but as a thing that is forbidden under a penalty—by a penal law. Look at the state, for instance. The state, in its legislation, appeals to the intelligence of every citizen, and says: "It is a wrong thing to steal; it is right to be honest." Does the state content itself with that? No; it says: "It is a wrong thing to steal. Now, if you steal, I will put you in jail." In other words, the right is forced upon us by the legislation of our country; and the wrong is prohibited, not only by precept, but by punishment.

Now, the next great element of a people's salvation is some powerful organization appealing to the conscience—appealing to our inner soul, and the heart of every individual man, and urging

upon that man public and personal morality and honesty, and urging it so that, if he violate one, or forget the other, that organization, or that law, will come down upon him and punish him; for it is by the dread of punishment, as well as by the hope of reward, that we are actuated in avoiding what is wrong and doing what is right. Wherever religion is, it must bring this power, or it is worthless. I ask you, where is this power? Where is the power that prohibits a wrong by a penal law, except in the Catholic Church?

A Protestant man, honorable, high-minded, a first-class citizen, sees an opening before him to do "a smart thing." He can make twenty thousand dollars by it. It is not a very fair transaction; there is a twist in it; there is something in it that he knows is not right. But then twenty thousand dollars, and nobody is the wiser! He does the thing and he makes the money. Conscience tells him that it is wrong. There is no power to urge the wrong upon him as a penal law. The Catholic does the same thing; but while he does it, the thought in his mind is: "Oh, this will never do; when I go to confession, I will have to tell all this. And the worst of it is that the priest will make me give back every cent of it. If I am dying, and send for him, he won't lay his hand over me, or give me communion or extreme unction, until he has first the draft of restitution." Give back he must, every cent. A Protestant man gets angry with his neighbor, and in his anger he says: "That is a dishonest and disreputable fellow." He goes out and says things, and injures and, perhaps, ruins the man's good name and character. He is very sorry for it afterward; and when he has said before God, "I am sorry that I have injured my neighbor," there is an end to it; he thinks no more is necessary. The Catholic man knows that he must first break his heart with sorrow for saying that unkind word; and when he has made restitution to his God, he has to go out and say to his neighbor: "Do you remember the day when I said such and such a fellow was a blackguard?" "Oh, yes; I remember it very well." "Well, I told a lie that day; I was the blackguard myself." Now, people of America, I ask you to consider this great point. If the intelligence of America

THE PENNY OF CÆSAR

FROM THE PAINTING BY VALENTIN

"Then the Pharisees, going away, consulted among themselves how to ensnare Jesus in his speech. And they send to him their disciples, with the Herodians, saying: 'Master, we know that thou art a true speaker, and teachest the way of God in truth: neither carest thou for any man: for thou dost not regard the person of men. Tell us, therefore, what dost thou think: Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?' But Jesus, knowing their wickedness, said: 'Why do ye tempt me, ye hypocrites? Show me the coin of the tribute.' And they offered him a penny. And Jesus said to them: 'Whose image and inscription is this? They say to him: 'Cæsar's.' Then he saith to them: 'Render, therefore, to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and to God the things that are God's.'"

would only condescend to weigh the Catholic Church and Catholic morality on their own merits, the mind of America would be the most Catholic of any in the whole world.

The third great element of the safety, security, and the strength of a people is the sanctity of the marriage-tie; the sanctity inviolable; the sanctity so great that no hand in heaven, or earth, or hell can touch it to break it, except the hand of the angel of death. I say this is the third great element of the people's safety. And why? Because of the inviolable fidelity of the marriage-tie, binding the husband and the wife, in not only the strongest human bond of love, but the strongest sacramental bond of union, upon which, as it were, one drop of the blood of Jesus Christ falls in the sacrament of matrimony, to seal it so that it cannot be dissolved; upon it depends the procreation of children, so that the state may have citizens; and the education of children, so that the state may have worthy citizens.

A multitude of people are no blessing, unless that multitude be educated so as to bring out in them their intellectual, moral, and spiritual existence. To do that the mother must be secure of her position. She must be the queen in her own house. From that throne upon which the Church of God seated her in the day when she sealed the matrimonial contract—from that throne, no hand in heaven, on earth, or in hell must be allowed to drag that woman down. If she is not secure with the security of the sacrament—with the security, that is to say, of God—the very fountain of matrimonial love is poisoned, and the very source of all domestic happiness is embittered. How can a woman love with all her heart a man if she believes it is in that man's power to repudiate her; to put her forth an exile and an outcast from her house; to separate her from her children, and drive her away from home, when his eye has become fascinated with another and a more handsome face and form than hers?—how can she love him? The children, too, depend altogether upon the mother. All that is to be brought out, of God or man, in that young soul, must be brought out by the mother's hand. The father is engaged in his business, and is always from

home; and he is toiling all the week; and when he comes home, it is not for domestic care, but for domestic bliss. The mother's duty and business are at home. Under her hand the child must grow —the child which is "father to the man"—as Jesus of Nazareth grew under the hand of Mary. If that mother is not secure of her position—if that mother may be calumniated and disgraced before any tribunal in the land, and then, with the divorce paper in hand, sent out into the wide world, a discarded wife, and a childless mother, what confidence have you then for the family? Who will care for the children? Who will educate them?

The day that modern society admitted the divorce, modern society did what Samson did in the temple of the Philistines—a mighty edifice, magnificent in all its proportions, crowded with all the nobility of the Philistines. Turning to his servant, he said: "Bring me over, and let me put my arms around the pillars." He was brought over to the two massive pillars on which the mighty edifice stood. He cast his strong and athletic arms around them; he swayed his great chest to and fro; they tottered and trembled under his grasp; till, with a crash like the thunder of God, down came the whole building; and every man there, the Israelite leader himself included, was destroyed in the ruins. Modern society, in the day that it admitted the law of divorce, shook its own pillars and foundations; and if there were not a Catholic Church to uphold the falling edifice, the whole concern would come tumbling about your ears. You would be reduced, by that very act, to the first forms of barbarism and savagery, out of which modern civilization has come.

Now, do you imagine that the womanhood of America—to say nothing of the manhood—so intellectual, so well educated, and, you will pardon me for saying it, so anxious to assert their rights —do you imagine that the womanhood of America will allow this divorce business to continue? No, no! The woman must be the crowned queen in her own house; and no hand, save the hand of death, must be allowed to pluck that crown from her head. The woman, in her household, must be the empress of her home and her children. The man whom she has honored by her love, must

not only be the provider of her daily bread, but must do her the homage that he swore to her at the altar of matrimony. And as the Catholic Church assures to the women of America this social position and unshaken privilege, if there is nothing else to make America Catholic, the women of America will do it. They will do it in self-defence.

When that law of divorce was established in England, I happened to be in Rome, and a Protestant lady, engaged to a Protestant English gentleman, was in Rome at the time. She heard a sermon of mine on these questions of marriage and divorce, and she said: "I am bound to become a Catholic out of self-respect and in self-defence"; and she wrote that very day to release herself from her engagement to her Protestant lover, and said: "My dear friend, if you will become a Catholic, and will share with me the belief in the inviolable tie of marriage, I will marry you; but if you do not do this, if you remain in a religion which makes divorce possible, I cannot marry you."

The women of America will do it if the manhood refuse. But the manhood will not refuse. For the gentleman of America knows that to restrain passion and to enforce the sacrament of matrimony by penal law, and to make the man atone for the sin he commits, is as necessary as the marriage-tie. So, out of both great resources of society, I hold that the future of America must be Catholic. And if the day ever comes, that this mighty nation, flinging aside all this miserable discussion on what Mr. So-and-so thinks about such and such a text of Scripture, and what Mr. This-and-that thinks about such another text—as if it mattered a farthing what he says about the Scripture if he is not inspired by God—when that day comes, and these glorious principles shall assert their dignity and majesty, terrible will be the strength of America in that day: when, for all material and national purposes, the government of the land will know that the people, in millions or hundreds of millions, are with them like a unit, like one man; when the national councils will be undismayed by the religious question; when, wherever the interests of America are concerned, and wherever truth

and justice and law are to be vindicated, the country will be enabled to draw that mighty sword with a certain and unhesitating hand, and with a united blow strike for God in heaven, and for the highest interests of man upon earth.

But our friends who are not Catholics say: "This is all very fine; this priest shows us the advantages very well; but what about the danger?" We constantly hear, "Beware of the Papists! Beware of the Catholics! Slavery! slavery!" Is Catholicity slavery? Listen. On every question outside of the religious question—the question of faith—we are as free as our fellow-citizens, and free to take this side or that in politics, or free to take this form or that form of government, or free to express our opinions upon every question outside of the religious question. And why are we not free on the religious question? For the simple reason that we know what the Church teaches; and we know that to be the truth, and we do not feel ourselves free to contradict the truth. This is the only reason. And is that slavery when a man feels that he is not at liberty to contradict what he knows to be the truth? Is there a man here now listening to me, who would be capable of telling a deliberate lie, and contradicting what he knows to be true? You would say, "I cannot do it. I know that I would be telling a lie if I did." Then if a man came to you and said, "You cannot do it; you are a slave," you would say, "No, I am free; for the supremacy of liberty is so to appreciate the truth as to be incapable of contradicting it."

What was the definition of freedom that came from the lips of our divine Lord. I am sure that every man that believes in Christ will admit that he is the best authority when he gives a definition of freedom. Here are his words: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The knowledge of the truth is freedom, according to Christ—the best authority that I can give you—the God who made us—the God who redeemed us; the knowledge of the truth is freedom. I will prove it to you. Suppose that you were all Protestants, and that I was a Protestant minister—the Lord between us and harm!—and that I came here to speak

to you on a religious question which I had been studying for the last five years or more, until my brain became a little crazy on it. For instance, I had come to the conclusion that the Gospel was a myth, and that there never was such a person as our Lord at all; that, having read what Voltaire said, and what Spinoza said, and what somebody else said, and thinking what historical works have been contradicted, I said: "Why should not the Gospel be contradicted?" and I came to the conclusion that the whole thing is a humbug; and I came before you this evening, and you were all Protestants, and supposed me to be an eloquent man, with great powers of persuasion; and I began to tell you the whole Gospel was a lie; and I denied Jesus over and over; and I hammered upon it with energy of action, with splendid diction, with beauty of illustration, with poetic imagery, until, at last, I persuaded half of the people who were listening; and you said: "It is true; the man is speaking truth; the Gospel *is* a humbug!" Now, I ask, what defence would you have for your religion against my eloquence and persuasiveness? None whatever; because it has been a question of what is true and what is false, and you cannot tell yourself which is right.

But I may be a Catholic; and I come to you and preach to you, and as long as I am speaking of any question connected with the Church, you hear me; and if I bring it out forcibly, and if I illustrate it beautifully, you are delighted. But suppose I just let slip a word against the Catholic faith; suppose I gave a hint that Christ is not present in the Eucharist; or gave a hint that the priest cannot forgive sin, every Catholic would rise up and say: "Unmantle him!" Every Catholic would rise up and shut his ears, and say: "No more of this; that's a lie!" What is it that saves a Catholic from the most terrible form of tyranny that can be exercised, namely, the tyranny of a superior intellect trying to oppress a lower? What is it that saves you from this? It is the fact that you know the truth. You would say to him: "I know what the Catholic Church teaches; and she is wiser than either you or I. You are contradicting her now; and you are a liar!" There-

fore, Catholicity is not slavery. It is the highest and the grandest form of intellectual freedom, if freedom be—as Christ declares it is—the knowledge of the truth.

The next great difficulty is, "Ah! if America become Catholic, you priests and bishops, you will have a good time of it then. You have a knack of increasing and multiplying; and we should have the whole country overspread with priests; nothing but priests; it will be old Italy over again; a priest in every house; a priest sticking his nose into every man's business; a priest laying hold of this, that, and the other." There is nothing easier than to get up a cry against a man or a body of men; and, as a Quaker gentleman once said, "You might as well hang a dog at once as to give him a bad name." What is easier than to say of a dog that is going across the street, "That dog is mad?" And if you cry, "Mad dog! mad dog!" you will have a crowd at the unfortunate animal's heels, and they will run him to death. Pretty much like this mad dog case is the cry, "Priest! priest!" Now, I put the question this way. First of all, the priest is by education a gentleman. I don't care what he is by birth. He must learn so much of Latin and Greek, and philosophy and history. So that by education he must be a gentleman. Now, no gentleman pokes his nose into other people's business. I have been for above twenty years a priest, and I never yet crossed the threshold of any man's house without being first invited. I waited until I was asked. I will tell you what is more; as a rule, the priest has to be invited oftener, and pressed harder, than any other man before he goes, because he has a good deal to do, and cannot afford to lose time.

Again, it is said, "Oh, but you'll gather up all the money in the country; you will beggar us all. If America were Roman Catholic, you would have the bishops and priests rolling in money; nothing but gold and silver and greenbacks would it be. We want nothing to do with them." Listen, again. The Catholic Church, in her religious orders, obliges every man, before she raises him to the priesthood, to swear a solemn oath of poverty, that he will never lay his hand upon so much as one cent and say, "I want this

for myself." That vow I made twenty-five years ago. I have been in the way of making money as much as any man. One cent I could not take and say, "This is mine; I will take it for myself." If I did that, I would be guilty of sin. And all that you have to do is to multiply the cents until you get three or four dollars, and that would make a mortal sin, and would send me to hell for all eternity.

We hear a good deal about the wonderful wealth of the bishops and priests; yet when we come to know the truth, they are as poor as Job—men who might be rich through ability, education, and talent, if they had lived for themselves in many of the walks of life. "Oh, Father," some men have said to me, "if we had you among us at the Bar, you would make a skilful lawyer." And I was once told by a comedian, "Oh, Father Tom, you mistook your vocation; if you had gone on the stage, you would have made a fortune long since." And yet I am as poor as Job. And there is, not a hundred miles from this platform on which I stand, a bishop who has brains and intellect and education that might have lifted him to the very supremacy of affairs in America, and he is only a bishop, and as poor as Job. A bishop in France will consider his fortune as made if he can get a thousand dollars or two thousand dollars a year; and out of that he has to support all the poor of the parish; he has to contribute to all the hospitals, and then to look after the schools; and he has to keep himself with a certain amount of grandeur—because one of the titles of a bishop in France is *votre grandeur*. It is very hard, when you have given away to the schools and hospitals and churches, to be *grand* on a fourth part of a thousand dollars a year.

When the Pope's enemies went to Rome, they thought they would find him wealthy; but they found a man who has been twenty-five years Pope of Rome,[1] and his personal expense for his food and clothes, and everything else, never exceeded one hundred and twenty pounds sterling a year. Six hundred dollars kept

[1] The eloquent speaker here alludes to the well-known simplicity of life of His Holiness Pope Pius IX.

him. We cannot be rich; and why? Because the Catholic priest is bound to preach the Gospel that says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit"; and the Catholic bishop is bound not to tell a lie when he has spoken in the name of God, nor to contradict it by his own actions.

Where is the danger of America from Catholicity? Is Catholicity opposed to a republican form of government? I answer from the history of the mediæval republics of Italy; they were the freest republics which ever existed—the republics of Genoa and Tuscany and Venice—and they were formed under the immediate patronage and protection of the Church of Rome. For hundreds and hundreds of years the little Republic of San Marino, which is only one hill with a few hundred families with their little huts, has been a republic—yes, for more than a thousand years. There it was by the side of the Pope; and, instead of crushing out the little state, he proclaimed its liberty. And, accordingly, the few families of San Marino have been making laws for themselves for more than a thousand years. It is true that the Catholic Church herself is a monarchy. It could not be anything else. The meaning of the word is derived from the Greek *monos*, one, and *archos*, a ruler—one ruler or chief. It must be so in religious or church matters. We must recognize a head. But one of the most glorious governments that the Catholics ever established and protected was the government that the Jesuits established in South America; and that was a republic. Let no man say that a republic is opposed to Catholicity. On the contrary, the greatest enemy that the Catholic Church has ever had in her way was an old, pedantic, narrow-minded despot, who endeavored to oppress the people with one hand, and to strike down the Church with the other, that he might make a god of himself. It is to the people that the Catholic Church appeals. There is no government in the world, this moment, that is not opposed to her, is not trying to strike her to the earth. It is to the people that she appeals. And as long as the people have the making of their own laws, as long as they have the shaping of their own institutions, as in this country

to-day, so long Catholicity will flourish here more than under any other government upon earth.

I think I have sufficiently proved my theme—that Catholicity is much more likely to be the safety than the danger of the great American Republic. What remains? It remains for such among the audience as have honored me this evening, who are not Catholics, to consider, intellectually and deeply, these words of mine—what truth is in them. And it remains for you, my Catholic friends, to build up the glorious argument of the Church's liberty, the Church's purity, the Church's unity and sanctity, and to corroborate it by the manliness and honesty and sobriety and sanctity of your own lives. Vain, vain as is the hum of the summer bee will be the word of the Catholic apologist or lecturer, if America be able to turn around and say: "Here are the people who are supposed to illustrate it; and their lives are not the lives of worthy citizens." But when we are able, as we advance those glorious truths, to show that our lives are not opposed to our logic and convictions, we can say to the world: "Look at the great, generous heart of America; look at these Catholics. Where have you better citizens? Have you more honest or patriotic men in the state? Where are the men more able to make the laws for America, and more willing to go out into the gap and shed their blood and give their lives in defence of America's freedom, than the Catholics?" Then, indeed, the argument will be irresistible. America will come—young, glorious, mighty in intellect, mighty in material power, mighty in energy, in human force—she will come to demand of God, at the hands of the Catholic Church, the crowning grace of unity of faith and sacramental sanctity, which the Catholic Church alone can throw around her; and, with this crown on her laurelled brow, the ancient despotisms of the world will bend the knee in craven fear, and do homage to magnificent Columbia!

CHAPTER XXV

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS—EDUCATION OF THE CLERGY—CHRISTIAN EDUCATION—GOOD READING—THE CATHOLIC PRESS

The earliest Christian school—"Imperial schools"—Reading of pagan authors forbidden by St. Jerome—Monasteries as training schools—Europe invaded by the barbarians—Survival of episcopal and monastic schools—Institutions of learning in Ireland—Suppression of the schools of Athens—Influence of St. Benedict upon Western Europe—Education under Charlemagne—The Normans as propagators of learning—Lanfranc and St. Anselm—Beginning of modern universities at Paris—William of Wykeham—The public schools of England—Venerable De la Salle, founder of the Christian Brothers—Repressive legislation in England—Academies and colleges of the Jesuit fathers—Public schools of the United States—Catholic parochial schools—Education of the clergy—Of the laity—Good reading—The Catholic press.

A BOY is usually sent to school in order that he may obtain, with greater ease and fewer interruptions than would be possible at home, knowledge which will be serviceable to him in after life. This is a motive which acts on parents independently of state instigation; it filled the school of Flavius at Venusia with "big boys, the sons of big centurions,"[1] and took Horace to that superior establishment at Rome which received the sons of "knights and senators." To these voluntary schools, which doubtless existed in every part of the Roman empire, and were closely connected with the movement of pagan society, it does not appear that Christian parents in the first three centuries sent their sons. The earliest Christian school of which we have a distinct account—that of Pantænus at Alexandria (A.D. 180)—was one for religious and catechetical instruction (*hieron logon katecheseon*).[2] The earliest state provision for secondary instruction was made by the Emperor Vespasian,[3] who established a group of

[1] Horace, Satires, i. 6, 73.

[2] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl.

[3] J. B. Mullinger, The Schools of Charles the Great (1877), p. 12.

"imperial schools" at all the great provincial towns; Besançon, Arles, Cologne, Rheims, and Treves are particularly mentioned. In these schools rhetoric, logic, and Latin and Greek literature were well taught, and many a Christian apologist owed to them the mental culture which he employed, after his conversion, in the service of Christ. When the empire had become Christian, these schools still retained the old methods and subjects of instruction, and even, to a great extent, the old spirit. St. Jerome, who had himself been educated in one of them, was alive to the perilous nature of this influence, and interdicted the reading of the pagan authors to all those under his direction who were in training for the religious life. Every bishop's residence was from the first more or less definitely a school, in which clerics were trained for the ecclesiastical life. Similarly, after the commencement of the monastic life under St. Anthony and St. Hilarion, the monastery, besides subserving the ends of self-discipline and continual intercession, became a school for training monks. This was especially seen in the monasteries in Gaul which followed the rule of the abbot Cassian of Marseilles. Early in the fifth century the invasions of the barbarians began; for four centuries Western Europe weltered in chaos, and the institutions of civilized life perished. In the cities of Gaul, as the Franks pressed southward, the old municipal schools—the schools of the Rhetoricians and the Grammarians—dwindled and were dispersed. Lay life became barbarous; and the arts of barbarism—which are chiefly fighting, destruction, and coarse indulgence—do not stand in need of schools. But in the wreck the episcopal and monastic schools survived, and, through the degradation of lay life, became ever more attractive. In the island of Lerins, the abbot Honoratus, about 400, founded a celebrated monastery, the school of which was known as the Studium Insulanum. Ireland, soon after its conversion by St. Patrick, was dotted over with monastic schools, in which the learning then accessible was prosecuted with remarkable success.

The suppression of the schools of Athens by order of Justinian (529) sounded the knell of the educational institutes of antiquity.

These schools were, in fact, a university, although that name was of later introduction. They had never been able to shake off the pagan modes of thought which gave birth to them, and now the advancing tide of Christian ideas engulfed them, without being able for a long time to supply their place. A few months after the suppression, St. Benedict founded the abbey of Monte Cassino, and the schools for the erection of which his rule provides were soon spread over Western Europe. These gradually produced a race of teachers and students whose higher and wider views suggested the resuscitation of academic life. It is sufficient to mention the names of Iona, Lindisfarne, Canterbury, York, Fulda, Rheims, Corbie, Fleury, and Seville—not as being all of Benedictine origin, but as among the best schools to be found in the troubled period from the fifth to the tenth century.

The great organizing mind of Charlemagne endeavored to make use of education, as of all other forces within his reach, for restoring civilization in the West. He invited Alcuin, the Scholasticus of York, as the best-known teacher in Europe, to his court at Aix-la-Chapelle, and gave into his charge the palace school. Conscientious and painstaking, Alcuin was yet essentially narrow; there is something cramped and unsatisfactory in his way of handling all the subjects of his slender curriculum. The age of universities was not yet. Charlemagne, and his son after him, were perpetually urging the bishops to improve their schools. Rabanus Maurus, a pupil of Alcuin, made the school of Fulda illustrious; that of Corbie, in the same age, produced Paschasius Radbert. The *trivium* and *quadrivium*—the invention of which is ascribed by some to Martianus Capella, a Carthaginian professor of rhetoric, by others to St. Augustine—supplied the scheme of the most advanced instruction for several centuries. Between 850 and 1000, the inroads of the Normans and Danes again made havoc of all that had been hitherto done in France and England to promote education.

The Normans, however, when once solidly converted, became the most active propagators of all civilizing ideas that the world has ever seen. The Norman school of Bec, founded in the eleventh

century by the abbot Herluin, numbered among its teachers Lanfranc and St. Anselm. In schools of this class, where knowledge was sought at first hand and philosophy disdained conventional methods, university ideals began to emerge. In the twelfth century, at Paris, commences the history of modern universities. After the establishment of these centres of superior teaching, the secondary school became, in theory, on the one hand a stage of preparation for the university, on the other a place of final training for those who had to begin work early. But for a long time the first of these two aspects of a secondary school overpowered the other. William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, founded there, in 1373, the school which still exists, expressly in order to feed the college (New College) which he was establishing at Oxford. The Winchester foundation was for a warden and ten fellows, three chaplains and three clerks in orders, an *informator* or head-master, a *hostiarius* or second master, seventy scholars who were to be " poor and in need of help," and sixteen choristers. Imitating this example, Henry VI founded the school at Eton in 1440, as a nursery to King's College, Cambridge. The later public schools of England—Westminster, Rugby, Harrow, etc.—have been founded, speaking generally, upon the model of these two, but without the same close connection with the universities.

Toward the end of the seventeenth century, the necessity of separating primary or elementary instruction from secondary began to make itself felt. The greater complexity and variety of employments, and the increased application of science to all the useful arts, made it desirable, if not indispensable, that the laboring class also should at least be instructed in letters and in the art of calculation. Primary instruction on a large scale was first tried (1684) by the Venerable De la Salle, the founder of the Christian Brothers. The new grade had its two aspects—that by which it was a stage of preparation for the secondary school, and that by which it gave a final training. Up to very recent times the former aspect was little regarded; but, at present, the advantage of making free and easy communications by which the best scholars can pass from the pri-

mary to the secondary, and from that to the superior grade of instruction, is clearly perceived.

All English schools before the Reformation had a Catholic character. That being withdrawn from them by the change of religion, and the laws prohibiting the erection of new schools under Catholic teachers, those who adhered to the old faith were put to great straits for several generations in order to get their children educated. A single sample of Protestant legislation will show what difficulties had to be faced. By 11 and 12 William III, c. iv, " if any Papist, or person making profession of the Popish religion, shall keep school, or take upon himself the education or government or boarding of youth, he shall be adjudged to perpetual imprisonment in such place within this kingdom as the King by advice of his Privy Council shall appoint." Unless foreign education were sought, obscure private schools were the only available resort in England. The first school of a higher class was that established at Sedgley Park (it had previously existed in a humble way at Newcastle-under-Lyne) by Bishop Challoner in 1763.

During colonial days the Jesuit fathers had academies, when possible, in Maryland, that at Bohemia being the most famous. After the Revolution, Georgetown College was founded in 1791.

The monitorial system of Bell and Lancaster, by means of which it was considered that primary instruction could be much extended at little expense by setting the elder children as " monitors " to teach the rudiments to the younger, was brought out in 1797. The primary schools of Prussia, organized under Hardenberg with great skill and thoroughness, drew general attention; and in 1833 the first public grant, £20,000, in aid of the elementary education of the people, was voted by the British Parliament, and its administration confided to a Committee of the Privy Council. For Catholics was established, in 1847, the " Catholic Poor School Committee," which, by maintaining efficient training schools for masters and mistresses, enables Catholic managers to obtain

their fair share of the Parliamentary grant for elementary education.

In Ireland the penal laws rendered the erection of Catholic schools impossible until about a hundred years ago, when the ill-success of the war against the Americans compelled certain relaxations. A secondary school for forty boarders was founded at Burrell's Hall, Kilkenny, in 1783, under Drs. Lanigan and Dunne. It throve exceedingly, and was transformed in 1836 into St. Kieran's College, under which name it still exists. Of more recent foundation are Carlow and Thurles Colleges, and the Jesuit Colleges of Clongowes and Tullabeg. These institutions, though without State aid or inspection, are already more flourishing than the Royal and Charter Schools—founded in the bad times in order to preserve and extend Protestant ascendancy—could ever boast of being.

The National Board of Education—in the schools of which a combined literary instruction was to be given to children of all creeds during certain hours in the day, while separate religious teaching might be given to those whose parents desired it before or after those hours, and also on one particular day of the week—was organized through the exertions of Mr. Stanley, Chief Secretary for Ireland (afterward Earl of Derby), in 1831. The bishops accepted this arrangement, not as the best, but as the best obtainable, measure; and under it, notwithstanding the difficulties caused by extreme poverty, elementary school training has penetrated into every corner of Ireland.

In the United States a system of State schools has been established which extends to most of the States. It is sectarian, entirely controlled by Protestants, with Protestant superintendents, a vast majority of teachers Protestants, school-books essentially Protestant, and the whole influence anti-Catholic. To save their children from perversion by this proselytizing system, Catholics have been compelled to extend their parochial schools, and to organize them into a thorough and efficient system. They now exist in all parts, and number many hundred thousand pupils.

THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF THE CLERGY

One of our first cares has been to provide for the more perfect education of aspirants to the holy priesthood. It has always been the Church's endeavor that her clergy should be eminent in learning. For she has always considered that nothing less than this is required by their sacred office of guarding and dispensing Divine truth. "The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge," says the Most High, "and the people shall seek the law at his mouth." This is true in all times; for no advance in secular knowledge, no diffusion of popular education, can do away with the office of the teaching ministry, which our Lord has declared shall last forever. In every age it is and shall be the duty of God's priests to proclaim the salutary truths which our Heavenly Father has given to the world through his Divine Son; to present them to each generation in the way that will move their minds and hearts to embrace and love them; to defend them, when necessary, against every attack of error. From this it is obvious that the priest should have a wide acquaintance with every department of learning that has a bearing on religious truth. Hence in our age, when so many misleading theories are put forth on every side, when every department of natural truth and fact is actively explored for objections against revealed religion, it is evident how extensive and thorough should be the knowledge of the minister of the Divine Word, that he may be able to show forth worthily the beauty, the superiority, the necessity of the Christian religion, and to prove that there is nothing in all that God has made to contradict anything that God has taught.

Hence the priest, who has the noble ambition of attaining to the high level of his holy office, may well consider himself a student all his life; and of the leisure hours which he can find amid the duties of his ministry, he will have very few that he can spare for miscellaneous reading, and none at all to waste. And hence, too, the evident duty devolving on us, to see that the course of educa-

THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL IN SESSION

BALTIMORE, DECEMBER, 1884

tion in our ecclesiastical colleges and seminaries be as perfect as it can be made. During the century of extraordinary growth now closing,[1] the care of the Church in this country has been to send forth as rapidly as possible holy, zealous, hard-working priests, to supply the needs of the multitudes calling for the ministrations of religion. She has not on that account neglected to prepare them for their divine work by a suitable education, as her numerous and admirable seminaries testify; but the course of study was often more rapid and restricted than she desired. At present our improved circumstances make it practicable both to lengthen and widen the course, and for this the Council has duly provided.

We are confident, beloved brethren, that you feel as deeply interested as ourselves in the accomplishment of these great results. This you have hitherto manifested by the zealous liberality by which you have enabled us to build and support our seminaries; and we are well assured that you will not be found wanting, should even greater efforts be necessary, to enable us to make the education and usefulness of the clergy as perfect as we desire. In the future, as in the past, look upon your annual contribution to the Seminary Fund as one of your most important duties as Catholics, and let your generosity be proportioned to the dignity and sacredness of the object for which you offer it.

And here we remind those among our Catholic people to whom God has been pleased to give wealth, that it is their duty and their privilege to consider themselves the Lord's stewards, in the use of what his Providence has placed in their hands; that they should be foremost in helping on the work of the Church of Christ during life, and make sure to have God among their heirs when they die; and we recommend to them as specially useful the founding of scholarships, either in their diocesan or provincial Seminaries, or in the American College in Rome, or elsewhere, as circumstances may suggest.

[1] The Third Plenary Council was held at Baltimore, U. S. A., in 1884.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION DEFINED BY THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL

SCARCELY, if at all, secondary to the Church's desire for the education of the clergy, is her solicitude for the education of the laity. It is not for themselves, but for the people, that the Church wishes her clergy to be learned, as it is not for themselves only, but for the people that they are priests. Popular education has always been a chief object of the Church's care; in fact, it is not too much to say that the history of civilization and education is the history of the Church's work. In the rude ages, when semi-barbarous chieftains boasted of their illiteracy, she succeeded in diffusing that love of learning which covered Europe with schools and universities; and thus from the barbarous tribes of the early middle ages, she built up the civilized nations of modern times. Even subsequent to the religious dissensions of the sixteenth century, whatever progress has been made in education is mainly due to the impetus which she had previously given. In our own country, notwithstanding the many difficulties attendant on first beginnings and unexampled growth, we already find her schools, academies, and colleges everywhere, built and sustained by voluntary contributions, even at the cost of great sacrifices, and comparing favorably with the best educational institutions in the land.

These facts abundantly attest the Church's desire for popular instruction. The beauty of truth, the refining and elevating influences of knowledge, are meant for all, and she wishes them to be brought within the reach of all. Knowledge enlarges our capacity both for self-improvement and for promoting the welfare of our fellow-men; and in so noble a work the Church wishes every hand to be busy. Knowledge, too, is the best weapon against pernicious errors. It is only " a little learning " that is " a dangerous thing." In days like ours, when error is so pretentious and aggressive, every one needs to be as completely armed as possible with sound knowledge—not only the clergy, but the people also, that

they may be able to withstand the noxious influences of popularized irreligion. In the great coming combat between Truth and Error, between Faith and Agnosticism, an important part of the fray must be borne by the laity, and woe to them if they are not well prepared. And if, in the olden days of vassalage and serfdom, the Church honored every individual, no matter how humble his position, and labored to give him the enlightenment that would qualify him for future responsibilities, much more now, in the era of popular rights and liberties, when every individual is an active and influential factor in the body politic, does she desire that all should be fitted by suitable training for an intelligent and conscientious discharge of the important duties that will devolve upon them.

Few, if any, will deny that a sound civilization must depend upon sound popular education. But education, in order to be sound and to produce beneficial results, must develop what is best in man, and make him not only clever but good. A one-sided education will develop a one-sided life; and such a life will surely topple over, and so will every social system that is built up of such lives. True civilization requires that not only the physical and intellectual, but also the moral and religious, well-being of the people should be promoted, and at least with equal care. Take away religion from a people, and morality would soon follow; morality gone, even their physical condition will ere long degenerate into corruption which breeds decrepitude, while their intellectual attainments would only serve as a light to guide them to deeper depths of vice and ruin. This has been so often demonstrated in the history of the past, and is, in fact, so self-evident, that one is amazed to find any difference of opinion about it. A civilization without religion, would be a civilization of "the struggle for existence, and the survival of the fittest," in which cunning and strength would become the substitutes for principle, virtue, conscience, and duty. As a matter of fact, there never has been a civilization worthy of the name without religion; and from the facts of history the laws of human nature can easily be inferred.

Hence education, in order to foster civilization, must foster religion. Now the three great educational agencies are the home, the Church, and the school. These mould men and shape society. Therefore each of them, to do its part well, must foster religion. But many, unfortunately, while avowing that religion should be the light and the atmosphere of the home and of the Church, are content to see it excluded from the school, and even advocate as the best school system that which necessarily excludes religion. Few surely will deny that childhood and youth are the periods of life when the character ought especially to be subjected to religious influences. Nor can we ignore the palpable fact that the school is an important factor in the forming of childhood and youth—so important that its influence often outweighs that of home and Church. It cannot, therefore, be desirable or advantageous that religion should be excluded from the school. On the contrary, it ought there to be one of the chief agencies for moulding the young life to all that is true and virtuous and holy. To shut religion out of the school, and keep it for home and the Church, is, logically, to train up a generation that will consider religion good for home and the Church, but not for the practical business of real life. But a more false and pernicious notion could not be imagined. Religion, in order to elevate a people, should inspire their whole life and rule their relations with one another. A life is not dwarfed, but ennobled by being lived in the presence of God. Therefore the school, which principally gives the knowledge fitting for practical life, ought to be preëminently under the holy influence of religion. From the shelter of home and school, the youth must soon go out into the busy ways of trade or traffic or professional practice. In all these, the principles of religion should animate and direct him. But he cannot expect to learn these principles in the workshop or the office or the counting room. Therefore let him be well and thoroughly imbued with them by the joint influences of home and school, before he is launched out on the dangerous sea of life.

All denominations of Christians are now awaking to this

great truth, which the Catholic Church has never ceased to maintain. Reason and experience are forcing them to recognize that the only practical way to secure a Christian people is to give the youth a Christian education. The avowed enemies of Christianity in some European countries are banishing religion from the schools, in order gradually to eliminate it from among the people. In this they are logical, and we may well profit by the lesson. Hence the cry for Christian education is going up from all religious bodies throughout the land. And this is no narrowness and "sectarianism" on their part; it is an honest and logical endeavor to preserve Christian truth and morality among the people by fostering religion in the young. Nor is it any antagonism to the State; on the contrary, it is an honest endeavor to give to the State better citizens, by making them better Christians. The friends of Christian education do not condemn the State for not imparting religious instruction in the public schools as they are now organized; because they well know it does not lie within the province of the State to teach religion. They simply follow their conscience by sending their children to denominational schools, where religion can have its rightful place and influence.

Two objects, therefore, dear brethren, we have in view: to multiply our schools, and to protect them. We must multiply them till every Catholic child in the land shall have within its reach the means of education. There is still much to do ere this be attained. There are still thousands of Catholic children in the United States deprived of the benefit of a Catholic school. Pastors and parents should not rest till this defect be remedied. No parish is complete till it has schools adequate to the needs of its children, and the pastor and people of such a parish should feel that they have not accomplished their entire duty until the want is supplied.

But, then, we must also perfect our schools. We repudiate the idea that the Catholic school need be in any respect inferior to any other school whatsoever. And if hitherto, in some places, our people have acted on the principle that it is better to have an imper-

fect Catholic school than to have none, let them now push their praiseworthy ambition still further, and not relax their efforts till their schools be elevated to the highest educational excellence. And we implore parents not to hasten to take their children from school, but to give them all the time and all the advantages that they have the capacity to profit by, so that, in after life, their children may "rise up and call them blessed."

THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL ON THE NECESSITY OF GOOD READING

Let the adornments of home be chaste and holy pictures, and still more, sound, interesting, and profitable books. No indelicate representation should ever be tolerated in a Christian home. Artistic merit in the work is no excuse for the danger thus presented. No child ought to be subjected to temptation by its own parents and in its own home. But let the walls be beautified with what will keep the inmates in mind of our Divine Lord, and of his saints, and with such other pictures of the great and the good as will be incentives to civic and religious virtue.

The same remark applies equally to books and periodicals. Not only should the immoral, the vulgar, the sensational novel, the indecently illustrated newspaper, and publications tending to weaken faith in the religion and the Church of Jesus Christ, be absolutely excluded from every Christian home, but the dangerously exciting and morbidly emotional—whatever, in a word, is calculated to impair or lower the tone of faith or morals in the youthful mind and heart—should be carefully banished. Parents would be sure to warn and withhold their children from anything that would poison or sicken their bodies; let them be at least as watchful against intellectual and moral poison.

But let the family book-shelves be well supplied with what is both pleasant and wholesome. Happily, the store of Catholic literature, as well as works which, though not written by Catholics nor treating of religion, are pure, instructive, and elevating, is now

so large that there can be no excuse for running risk or wasting one's time with what is inferior, tainted, or suspicious. Remember, Christian parents, that the development of the youthful character is intimately connected with the development of the taste for reading. To books as well as to associations may be applied the wise saying: "Show me your company and I will tell you what you are." See, then, that none but good books and newspapers, as well as none but good companions, be admitted to your homes. Train your children to a love of history and biography. Inspire them with the ambition to become so well acquainted with the history and doctrines of the Church as to be able to give an intelligent answer to any honest inquiry. Should their surroundings call for it, encourage them, as they grow older, to acquire such knowledge of popularly mooted questions of a scientific or philosophical character as will suffice to make them firm in their faith and proof against sophistry. We should be glad to see thoroughly solid and popular works on these important subjects, from able Catholic writers, become more numerous. Teach your children to take a special interest in the history of our own country. We consider the establishment of our country's independence, the shaping of its liberties and laws, as a work of special Providence, its framers "building wiser than they knew," the Almighty's hand guiding them. And if ever the glorious fabric is subverted or impaired it will be by men forgetful of the sacrifices of the heroes that reared it, the virtues that cemented it, and the principles on which it rests, or ready to sacrifice principle and virtue to the interests of self or party. As we desire, therefore, that the history of the United States should be carefully taught in all our Catholic schools, and have directed that it be specially dwelt upon in the education of the young ecclesiastical students in our preparatory seminaries; so also we desire that it form a favorite part of the home library and home reading. We must keep firm and solid the liberties of our country by keeping fresh the noble memories of the past, and thus sending forth from our Catholic homes into the arena of public life not partisans but patriots.

THE CATHOLIC PRESS COMMENDED BY THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL

FINALLY, Christian parents, let us beg your earnest consideration of this important truth, that upon you, singly and individually, must practically depend the solution of the question, whether or not the Catholic press is to accomplish the great work which Providence and the Church expect of it at this time. So frequently and so forcibly has the providential mission of the press been dwelt upon by Popes and prelates and distinguished Catholic writers, and so assiduously have their utterances been quoted and requoted everywhere, that no one certainly stands in need of arguments to be convinced of this truth. But all this will be only words in the air, unless it can be brought home to each parent and made practical in each household. If the head of each Catholic family will recognize it as his privilege and his duty to contribute toward supporting the Catholic press, by subscribing for one or more Catholic periodicals, and keeping himself well acquainted with the information they impart, then the Catholic press will be sure to attain to its rightful development and to accomplish its destined mission. But choose a journal that is thoroughly Catholic, instructive, and edifying; not one that would be, while Catholic in name or pretence, uncatholic in tone and spirit, disrespectful to constituted authority, or biting and uncharitable to Catholic brethren.

Beloved brethren, a great social revolution is sweeping over the world. Its purpose, hidden or avowed, is to dethrone Christ and religion. The ripples of the movement have been observed in our country; God grant that its tidal wave may not break over us. Upon you, Christian parents, it mainly depends whether it shall or not; for, such as our homes are, such shall our people be. We beseech you, therefore, to ponder carefully all that we have said concerning the various constituents of a true Christian home, and, to the utmost of your ability, to carry them into effect. And we entreat all pastors of souls to bear unceasingly in mind, that upon

the Christian school and the Christian homes in their parishes must mainly depend the fruit of their priestly labors. Let them concentrate their efforts on these two points—to make the schools and the homes what they ought to be;—then indeed will they carry to the Lord of the harvest full and ripe sheaves, and the future generation will bless them for transmitting unimpaired the priceless gifts of faith and religion.

CHAPTER XXVI

FATHERS AND COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH

THE appellation of Fathers is used in a more general and a more restricted sense. In a general sense it denotes all those Christian writers of the first twelve centuries who are reckoned by general consent among the most eminent witnesses and teachers of the orthodox and Catholic doctrine of the Church.

Taken in this sense, it includes some names on which there rests more or less the reproach of heterodox doctrine. Origen, whose works, as we have them, contain grave errors frequently condemned by the highest authority in the Church, is one of these. Nevertheless, his writings are of the highest value for their orthodox contents. Eusebius of Cæsarea is another. Tertullian became an open apostate from the Catholic Church; yet his writings as a Catholic are among the most excellent and precious remains of antiquity. There are some others included among the Fathers in this greater latitude of designation who have not the mark of eminent sanctity.

In its stricter sense the appellation denotes only those ancient writers whose orthodoxy is unimpeachable, whose works are of signal excellence or value, and whose sanctity is eminent and generally recognized. The following list includes the names of the most illustrious Fathers, according to the most exclusive sense of this honorable title:

First century—St. Clement of Rome.

Second century—St. Ignatius, St. Justin, St. Irenæus.

Third century—St. Cyprian, St. Dionysius of Alexandria.

Fourth century—St. Athanasius, St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory

of Nyssa, St. Ephrem, St. Ambrose, St. Optatus, St. Epiphanius, St. John Chrysostom.

Fifth century—St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Leo the Great, St. Prosper, St. Vincent of Lerins, St. Peter Chrysologus.

Sixth century—St. Cæsarius of Arles, St. Gregory the Great.

Seventh century—St. Isidore of Seville.

Eighth century—Venerable Bede, St. John Damascene.

Eleventh century—St. Peter Damian, St. Anselm.

Twelfth century—St. Bernard.

A complete collection of the works of the Fathers contains many more names than these. Moreover, it is plain that the Fathers of the first six centuries, by the mere fact of their priority in time, are much more valuable witnesses to primitive faith and order, and that their writings are in a stricter sense sources of theological tradition, than the works of those who came later, however illustrious the latter may be.

There is also a gradation of rank among the Fathers, some having a much higher authority than others. As private doctors, no one of them has a final and indisputable authority taken singly, except in so far as his teaching is warranted by some extrinsic and higher criterion, or supported by its intrinsic reasons. As witnesses, each one singly, or several concurring together, must receive that credence which is reasonably due in view of all the qualities and circumstances of the testimony given. Their morally unanimous consent concerning matters pertaining to faith has a decisive and irrefragable authority.

It has always been held that God raised up in the earlier ages of the Church these highly gifted, learned, and holy men, and endowed them with special graces, that they might be the principal teachers of the mysteries and doctrines of the faith. Their writings are the great source of light and truth in theology, after the Holy Scriptures. The authority of their doctrine, in the proper sense of that word, is nevertheless derived from the sanction of the Ecclesia Docens, the only supreme and infallible tribunal.

The terms *concilium* and *sunodos* are synonymous, and denote, first, meetings of any kind, and next, in a more restricted sense, assemblies of the rulers of the Church, legally convoked, for the discussion and decision of ecclesiastical affairs. We find *concilium* employed in this technical sense by Tertullian about two hundred years after Christ, and *sunodos* perhaps a century later in the Apostolic Canons. Acts xv furnishes the first example of such a council, and we may conclude that the Apostles held it in consequence of a divine commission; otherwise they would not have dared to say, "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Language of the same kind is frequently used by or applied to later councils. Thus Constantine professed to revere the decision of the Nicene Fathers as "the sentence of the Son of God." Athanasius and Augustine expressed themselves in the same way, while Gregory the Great compares the authority of the first four councils with that of the Four Gospels. After the Apostolic Council, held according to the most probable chronology A.D. 51, we next hear of councils which met in Asia about 150 and were occasioned by the Montanist controversy.

Ecumenical councils are those to which the bishops and others entitled to vote are convoked from the whole world (*oikoumenē*), under the presidency of the Pope or his legates, and the decrees of which, having received Papal confirmation, bind all Christians.

The following is a chronological list of the ecumenical councils:

1. Nicæa, 325.
2. First of Constantinople, 381.
3. Ephesus, 431.
4. Chalcedon, 451.
5. Second of Constantinople, 553.
6. Third of Constantinople, 680.
7. Second of Nicæa, 787.
8. Fourth of Constantinople, 869.
9. First Lateran, 1123.
10. Second Lateran, 1139.

11. Third Lateran, 1179.
12. Fourth Lateran, 1215.
13. First of Lyons, 1245.
14. Second of Lyons, 1274.
15. Vienne, 1311.
16. Constance, 1414–18. This council was ecumenical only in its last sessions (42–45 inclusive) and with respect to certain decrees of earlier sessions, approved by Martin V.
17. Basle, 1431 and following years. The Council of Basle was ecumenical only till the end of the twenty-fifth session, and of these decrees Eugenius IV approved such only as dealt with the extirpation of heresy, the peace of Christendom, and the reform of the Church, and which at the same time did not derogate from the rights of the Holy See.
18. Ferrara-Florence, 1438–42. This council was really a continuation of that of Basle.
19. Fifth Lateran, 1512–17.
20. Trent, 1545–63.
21. Vatican, December 8, 1869, to July 18, 1870. The Vatican Council is still unfinished.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE WONDERFUL LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI

Birth of the saint—His father and mother—Worldly pursuits of the young Francis—His charity—Visions of Francis—Persecutions and humiliations—Francis begins a new life—Consoles and tends the leprous—Assists in repairing the church of St. Peter Damian—Restores other churches—Draws men to repentance—His disciples—Francis composes the rule of his order—Sets out for Rome—Unfavorably received by Innocent III—The Pope's vision—He receives and embraces Francis—Approves the rule—The saint returns to Assisi—His vision—Francis sends forth his disciples—St. Clare, foundress of the Order of Poor Clares—Multitudes flock to St. Francis—Another vision—The saint goes to Perugia—Interview with Honorius III—Temptation of St. Francis—Indulgence of Portiuncula—The saint's love for all God's creatures—The wolf of Gubbio—Francis journeys to the Holy Land—His interview with the Sultan—The saint's supreme love for the Church and the Blessed Sacrament—His meditations on the Passion—The Sacred Stigmata—Devotion of St. Francis to the Blessed Virgin—His death.

ST. FRANCIS, founder of the great order of Franciscans, was born at Assisi, of a rich merchant family, in the year 1182. His father's name was Peter Bernardone, and his mother, who was descended from the illustrious family of Bourlemont, was called Pica. A miraculous event accompanied his birth: his mother suffered such pain at the time that all believed her to be dying. At this critical moment a pilgrim of grave and stately appearance came to the door, and after receiving alms said, "If you take her to the stable and lay her down on a little straw, she will be safely delivered; for it is there God wishes her son to be born."

These words of the pilgrim seemed a message from heaven, for as soon as she was placed in a stable close to the house, she gave birth to her first-born child, the subject of this memoir. "Thus, like Jesus Christ," says our late Holy Father Leo XIII, "it happened that St. Francis was born in a stable. Little child as he was, his couch was of straw and on the ground. And it is also related that at that moment the presence of angelic choirs, and melodies wafted

through the air, completed this resemblance." A short time after, when the child was carried to the baptismal font, the pilgrim appeared again, and became his sponsor. The child then received the name of John, which was afterward changed to Francis by his father.

During his infancy another pilgrim who visited his father's house embraced him very affectionately, and said to his mother, "This child is sent by God into the world to do great things for his glory."

Francis, while employed by his father in the pursuit of worldly gain, gave himself to the amusements and gaieties of his age. He, however, amid all the follies of youth, preserved his heart from the stain of mortal sin. "For," says St. Bonaventure, "though of a gay and joyous spirit, and dwelling among covetous merchants, never did his pleasures lead him into the vicious courses of his wicked companions, or make him to set his heart on worldly treasures. For in his soul there ever dwelt a natural love for the poor of Christ. This instinctive charity grew with his growth, and filled his heart with tender sentiments of compassion for God's poor."

One day, being very much occupied with his father's business, contrary to his wonted charity, he passed, without assisting, a poor man who had asked alms of him. But speedily recollecting himself, he ran after the beggar, and when he had overtaken him, he gave him a large sum of money. At the same time he made a solemn promise that he would never refuse alms to any one who should ask it of him for the love of God. This promise he faithfully kept during the rest of his life.

Francis was accustomed to say that after this charitable act to the poor man, he could never hear the love of God spoken of without his heart being deeply moved. His natural gaiety, and the sweetness and unselfish generosity of his nature, made him a universal favorite with his fellow-townsmen and companions.

"A man of very great piety and evangelical simplicity who then lived at Assisi," says St. Bonaventure, "whenever he met Francis in the streets, would take off his cloak and spread it on the

ground before him, declaring that this young man would one day do great things for God, and was worthy of every honor."

But Francis did not as yet know the great purposes of God regarding him, being entirely taken up with his worldly affairs. About this time he was one day walking alone outside his native town, when he met a gentleman, once rich, but now clad in rags and reduced to the greatest distress.

Being moved with compassion at the sad state of this poor man, he took off his clothes and gave them to him. The following night, God, as a reward for his act of charity, showed him a magnificent and spacious palace filled with rich armor, all marked with the sign of redemption. Astonished at this sight, Francis asked for whom was all this rich armor prepared. God answered him, "For you, Francis, and your soldiers." When he awoke, he thought the vision foreboded some great earthly prosperity which he could obtain by the profession of arms. For this purpose he furnished himself with arms, servants, and horses, and then set out for Apulia, where he intended joining Gauthier de Brienne, who was at war with the Emperor of Germany.

On the first night of this journey, God spoke to him again, and, addressing him as a friend would a friend, said, "Francis, who can do more for you, the Lord or the servant? the rich man or the poor?"

"Surely the master and the rich man," answered Francis.

"Why, then," said the divine voice, "do you leave the Lord for the servant, and the God of infinite riches for the poor and frail mortal?"

Francis immediately cried out, like St. Paul, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

"Return to your own country," continued the divine voice; "for the vision with which you were favored signified a spiritual work, which you will accomplish, not by human counsel, but by the intervention of heaven."

As soon as the day dawned, Francis returned in haste to Assisi, and there awaited in joy and confidence the divine command.

From this time he gave himself up to a more perfect union with God in prayer. If at rare intervals he joined in the noisy revels of his old companions, he clearly showed that his heart was not with them.

He now spent his days in deeds of charity, and in the spiritual exercises of mortification and retreat. One day, while riding over the plain of Assisi, he met a poor leper. The sudden appearance of this revolting object filled him with disgust and horror: but remembering his resolution of becoming a soldier of Jesus Christ, he alighted from his horse, embraced the poor man, and gave him abundant alms. Having remounted his horse, he looked around the plain, but could not see the leper. He then understood that an angel had appeared to him under the form of a leper.

A short time afterward, as he was praying in a solitary place, and with sighs and tears earnestly imploring our Lord to grant him grace to know the divine will, Jesus Christ, nailed to the cross, appeared to him. At this sight Francis felt his heart melt within him, and the remembrance of the Passion was so indelibly imprinted upon his soul, that he could never afterward think of the cross without sighs and tears.

Jesus then spoke to him from the cross, and said, " He that will come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me."

Hitherto Francis had held the sight of lepers in horror: now for the love of Christ, who had become a leper in his Passion, he sought out and served those afflicted creatures with the greatest humility and love. About this time, when on a pilgrimage to St. Peter's at Rome, he exchanged his clothes with a poor man clad in rags, and remained all day among the crowd of beggars who surrounded the church door.

Such was the life Francis led when our Lord showed himself to him in a new way. One day, about the year 1206, Francis entered the poor chapel of St. Peter Damian, and poured out his soul before the crucifix, saying, " O God, great and glorious, Jesus Christ my Lord, enlighten, I pray thee, the darkness of my soul.

Give me true faith, a certain hope, and perfect charity; grant that I may know thee, O Lord, in order that I may always, and in all things, act according to thy most holy and perfect will."

He gazed with tearful eyes upon the cross while saying these words, and he heard a voice from the crucifix answering him: "Go, Francis, and restore my house which is falling."

The saint was filled with fear at the sound of the voice. He dreaded that he was the victim of an illusion. But the same voice from the crucifix repeated, "Go, Francis, and repair my house which is falling into ruins." Then his fear redoubled. He asked himself whence came this mysterious voice, and a third time the crucifix answered, "Go, Francis, restore my house which is falling into ruins, as you see." He now clearly understood that it was God who spoke to him from the crucifix, and his soul was filled with an ineffable consolation at the sound of the divine voice.

Thinking that our Lord wished him to repair the church of St. Damian, he hastened to his father's house, took some pieces of cloth, which he sold at Foligno, and offered the price to the priest of this little oratory. The good priest refused the gift; but Francis, full of contempt for earthly things, threw the money on the window-sill of the church, and so left it, as if it had been so much dust.

Now commenced for Francis a series of persecutions and humiliations to prepare him for the great work he was destined by God to perform. When he had lived some days with the priest of St. Damian's, his father, hearing of his intention, and thinking that he would disgrace his family if he were not at once prevented from carrying it out, came in great fury to the church of St. Damian. Francis, in the meantime, foreseeing his father's anger, hid himself in a cave during an entire month. There he unceasingly asked the Lord for strength to bear the persecutions of his father and friends, and to deliver him out of their hands, that he might be able to fulfil the pious purpose with which he had inspired him. Filled with strength from heaven through his holy retreat, he left his hiding-place and boldly proceeded to Assisi.

When his companions saw his emaciated appearance, and his change of mind and memory, they thought he had lost his senses. They ran after him, cast mud and stones at him, and treated him as a fool and madman. His father, attracted by the noise, rushed out upon him, and in a rage dragged him to the house, heaped reproaches upon him for the disgrace he had brought on his family, and then cruelly scourged and cast him into a dark recess under an old staircase. Francis bore all this without a murmur. The words of his beloved Master, "Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice sake," brought consolation and joy to his heart in the midst of these persecutions and sufferings.

His pious mother, who grieved at his sufferings, and saw how useless they were to change his resolution, delivered him from his place of confinement during the absence of his father. Bernardone, on his return, hearing that Francis was set at liberty, flew into a rage with his wife, and rushed to St. Damian's, where he was certain he would find the fugitive. Francis, who had gone to the little church to thank God for his liberty, now went forth to meet his father's wrath. He declared that he was ready to suffer everything for the love of Jesus Christ. Bernardone, seeing that neither threats nor punishments could shake the resolution of his son, sought for the price of the cloth. Francis showed it to him, still lying on the sill of the window, where he had thrown it.

This, however, did not satisfy the angry father; he required his son to make a juridical renunciation of his inheritance before the Bishop of Assisi. Francis gratified his father's wishes beyond his most sanguine expectations. He not only renounced all right to his father's possessions, but stripping himself of his garments, he gave them to his father, saying: "Hitherto I have called you my father on earth; now I can say in truth, 'Our Father, who art in heaven.'"

The bishop, admiring the fervor of the young man, embraced him tenderly, and shed tears as he covered him with his mantle. A poor laborer in the bishop's service gave Francis a coarse outer garment. This he accepted with gratitude, and tracing the sign of

salvation on it, he wore it joyfully, as it typified the life of a poor man crucified to the world.

" Thus," says St. Bonaventure, whose words we have followed in this narrative, " did this servant of the great King of heaven and earth strip himself of all things, that so he might follow the Lord, whom he truly loved, and who died naked on the cross; and thus did he arm himself with the sign of redemption, committing his soul to that sacred wood of our salvation, hoping so to escape by it from the shipwreck of the world."

Francis now began a new life. He went forth from the city to a solitary place, where he awaited the manifestation of the divine will. Here, in a lonely forest, he made the air resound with the praises of the Most High. Some robbers attacked him, and asked him who he was.

He answered, " I am the herald of the Great King."

They beat him unmercifully, and then cast him into a ditch full of snow, saying in mockery, " Go and rest in that hole, you herald of nothing, who call yourself herald of God."

When the robbers had gone he went again through the forest, rejoicing that he had been counted worthy to be reputed a fool for Christ's sake. He continued his journey through the forest, singing aloud his holy canticles, until he came to a monastery, where he received alms and remained some days serving the religious. But not finding what his soul desired here, he went to Gubbio, where an old friend gave him a poor habit like that worn by the hermits of his day.

Having now put on the habit of penance, Francis redoubled his zeal and works of perfection. He attended lepers, consoled them in their pains, washed their loathsome sores, and aided them in their necessities. Though at first he had the greatest repugnance to perform this work of charity, he afterward found delight in it, and " its bitterness now changed into sweetness of soul and body." God rewarded his charity toward one of these poor outcasts who cast himself at his feet. Francis, tenderly embracing him, kissed his hideous sores, and immediately the sick man was healed.

ECSTASY OF ST. FRANCIS

FROM THE PAINTING BY PHILIPPE LAURI

"I know not," says St. Bonaventure, "which of these two things is most worthy of admiration, the profound humility of such a kiss, or the marvellous power which wrought such a miracle." In his after life Francis became the father and apostle of the leprous; and when mightier cares withdrew him from that charge, his heart still turned toward them with a father's yearning.[1]

After practising these holy works of charity for some time, Francis returned to Assisi, and begged alms from door to door to repair the church of St. Damian, as thus he interpreted the command he had received, "to repair the house of God which was falling into ruins." He himself worked without intermission, carrying heavy stones on his shoulders, mixing the mortar, and assisting the masons and workmen.

The priest of St. Damian, seeing the zeal of the holy man, prepared food for him; but Francis said to himself, "This is not the life of poverty you ought to choose. You must go yourself from door to door, to receive the scraps which the faithful may give you. This is how you must live for love of him who was born poor, who lived in poverty, and who was buried in a sepulchre which did not belong to him."

The next day he went about the town, begging his sustenance like a poor man. When he began to eat this nauseous mixture of different food, he experienced a loathing and disgust which he could not overcome. But having made the sign of the cross over the bowl, he ate the scraps with an exquisite relish that exceeded all the pleasure he had tasted in the most deliciously prepared viands while in the world.

"Henceforth," says our late Holy Father Leo XIII, "amid the effeminacy and fastidiousness of the time, he is seen to go about careless and roughly clad, begging his food from door to door, not only enduring what is generally deemed most hard to bear—the senseless ridicule of the crowd—but even welcoming it with a wondrous readiness of joy. And this because he had embraced the folly of the Cross of Jesus Christ, deeming it the highest wisdom.

[1] See, also, "Father Damien, the Martyr of Molokai," Volume I, page 199.

Having penetrated and understood its awful mysteries, he plainly saw that nowhere else could his glory be better placed."

The work of St. Damian's church being finished, he restored another church, outside the city of Assisi, dedicated to St. Peter. He then began the restoration of a third church, named St. Mary of the Angels. This holy sanctuary was a mile from the city, and belonged to the Benedictines. His love for the Mother of God, and the favors he received here through her intercession, made him regard this church as the most endearing place on earth. "It was here," says St. Bonaventure, "he began his career humbly, pursued it courageously, and consummated it gloriously."

St. Francis, in his last moments, earnestly recommended to all his brothers the holy sanctuary as peculiarly dear to the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Immaculate Mother of God. It is now one of the most frequented shrines of the Church of God. The children of St. Francis revere it as the cradle and first home of the order. Here it was begun, here it was nurtured, and thence it has spread throughout the entire world.

One day, in the church of St. Mary of the Angels, Francis heard, in the Gospel of the Mass, "Do not possess gold or silver, nor money in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor a staff." He was overjoyed when he heard these words, for he felt they were addressed to himself. As soon as the Mass was finished, he asked the priest to explain the words of the Gospel.

When the minister of God had given their meaning, Francis cried out: "That is what I want! That is what I want! That is the object of all my ambition." He took his shoes from his feet, laid by his staff, cast away his money, and replaced his girdle with a rough cord. Francis now clothed himself in a poorer and coarser garb than the hermit's cloak which he had hitherto worn. He put on the habit of poverty, which his true children have worn, in every clime, to our own day.

Clothed with this religious habit, Francis went forth to draw men to repentance. His burning words, in simple and unadorned

language, went straight to the hearts of his hearers. The Holy Ghost seemed to inspire him with that "two-edged sword" of the Word "that pierces to the very marrow of the bones and joints." The world flocked to him, and in a short time he found himself surrounded by twelve disciples.

His first follower was Bernard of Quintavilla, a native of Assisi. He was struck by the strange life of Francis, and invited him to dine and sleep at his house. They both slept in the same room. Francis, believing that Bernard was asleep, arose from bed, cast himself on his knees, and with eyes raised toward heaven cried out, "My God and my all, thou art all to me. Thou art all my good, thou art my hope, my strength, my riches, my life, my joy, my happiness. Thou art all that I could desire." The whole night he unceasingly sent forth from his heart those flames of divine love. Bernard on the morrow resolved to become the disciple of Francis. The saint, however, told Bernard that they should first consult God in the matter.

They went to the church forthwith, and on the way were met by Peter of Cataneo, a learned canon of Assisi. He also offered himself to become a disciple of Francis. They heard Mass, and invoked the light of the Most High. The saint then desired the priest to open the book of the Gospel three times, in honor of the Most Holy Trinity. The first time he came upon the words, "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell all thou hast and give it to the poor." The second time he found, "Take nothing for your journey." The third time he lighted upon, "If any one will come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me."

"Here," said the holy man, "is our life and our rule; the life and rule of all those who shall come and join us. Go, then, and if you wish to attain to perfection, fulfil what you have heard."

Bernard immediately sold all his goods, for he was rich, and gave the money to the poor. Peter acted in like manner, and resigned his canonry. Both became disciples of Francis.

Egidius (Giles), a friend of Peter and Bernard, was absent when they renounced their possessions and followed Francis.

Seven days after, he also gave all his worldly goods to the poor and enrolled himself under the banner of holy poverty.

The first disciples of Francis were, for the most part, unlettered and without any human aid, and yet they went forth, like the apostles of old, to evangelize the world. They had neither bread to eat, nor whereon to lay their head. Poverty, however, was their joy and their strength. Their confidence in Divine Providence was unbounded, their peace of soul unchangeable. Jesus Christ alone was their love, and the ignominy of the Cross was their strength and glory. In many places their extreme poverty, their coarse habit, and their contempt for all earthly things made them to be suspected as heretics, or treated as fools and madmen; while, on the contrary, their perfect detachment from the world, and their spirit of penance, made them to be received in other places as the friends and true servants of God. As for themselves, when they were humbled and despised, they blessed God more than when they were treated with honor and veneration. Brother Egidius used to say to St. Francis: "All this respect robs us of our reward."

Francis, at the beginning of the year 1210, called his disciples around him and said: "Our good and merciful Lord wishes, my dearly beloved brethren, to extend our little family. We must now submit our way of life to the most holy Pontiff of Rome. For without his consent and approval, it seems to me that nothing can be stable or good in matters of faith, or in the religious life. Let us go, then, to our Mother, the Holy Roman Church. Let us make known to the Pope what our Lord has begun to do for us. We will then continue our work according to his will and his commands."

Thus the Seraphic Father would have the approval of the Apostolic See before he commenced the great work of founding his order. His disciples also, who were imbued with the same spirit of humility and docility as their holy founder, saw no safety except in perfect obedience to the Head of the Church. In the meantime they all betook themselves to prayer, while Francis composed the admirable rule of his order. This rule is founded on the strictest

poverty, prayer, humility, and self-denial. It contains the quintessence of the Gospel and the evangelical perfection in all its excellence.

After the rule was written, Francis with his disciples set out for Rome. He found Guy, Bishop of Assisi, in the Eternal City. The saint and his disciples were well received by this good prelate. He introduced Francis to Cardinal John of St. Paul, Bishop of Sabina, a holy and learned prince of the Church. A few days later Francis presented himself before the Pope. The time was very unfavorable. Innocent III, who then sat on the throne of St. Peter, was absorbed in most important business of the Church when Francis appeared before him. Hence he dismissed Francis abruptly, and would not allow him to make any explanations. The saint retired very humbly, and it was for him a source of joy that his work was begun with this cross and humiliation.

The following night the Pope seemed to see, in his sleep, a palm come out of the earth, grow little by little, produce branches, and become at last a magnificent tree. His Holiness was astonished, and asked what his vision could mean; then a divine light shone on him, and he understood that the palm-tree was the poor man whom he had treated so abruptly the day before. Next day he sent for Francis. The Papal messenger found him in the hospital of St. Anthony, near the Lateran, and conducted him immediately to the Vatican. The Pope now not only willingly heard his petition, but tenderly embraced him as a special friend of God. He, however, delayed to give his approbation to the rule, as some of the cardinals deemed it a novelty and above human strength. The strict poverty which required renunciation of all property, both personal and in common, seemed to them impossible to be observed.

Cardinal John of St. Paul, at a consistory held a few days afterward, answered these cardinals thus: "If we refuse this poor man's petition as a novelty, and as too hard to be observed, let us take care lest we offend the Gospel of Christ; for he only asks for a way of life conformable to the evangelical counsels. If any one shall say that the observance of the counsels contains anything irra-

tional or impossible to be observed, he commits blasphemy against Jesus Christ, the Author of the Gospel."

Then the Pope said to St. Francis: "Pray to Christ our Lord that he would make known his will to us."

A short time after this another vision was vouchsafed to the Pope. He saw the great church of St. John of Lateran sustained by St. Francis, whose strength alone prevented the tottering walls of the edifice from falling. "Truly," said the Pope, "this is the poor man who, by his works and words, will sustain the Church of Christ." He then approved the rule, bestowed many spiritual favors on St. Francis and his followers, and bade them go and preach penance throughout the world.

St. Francis after this returned to Assisi, and gathered his companions around him in a little hut. In a short time the number of his disciples increased so much that he was obliged to find a house sufficiently large to receive them all. He applied to the Benedictines, who willingly gave up to him the chapel of St. Mary of the Angels. The Benedictines, however, obliged St. Francis to promise that this house should be held as the principal and mother-house of the order in all future time. But as the saint wished to receive it as a loan, he guaranteed to give the Benedictines a basket of fish every year to acknowledge their right to the house.

St. Francis, when taking possession of this little sanctuary, had hardly knelt in prayer when he saw our beloved Lord on a throne over the altar. The Blessed Virgin and a host of angels were in his company. Dazzled by this vision, and trembling at the sight of our Redeemer, he fell prostrate on the ground. While thus in lowly adoration, he heard our Divine Lord say, "We are come, my Mother and I, to betroth you and yours to this place of our predilection, to this house, which is dear to us in a special manner."

Filled with joy, St. Francis cried out, "Yes, this place is truly holy! It is more worthy to be the abode of angels than of men."

In the beginning of 1211 he called his disciples and said to them, "Jesus Christ has chosen you his preachers, men of low

degree, men altogether insignificant, so that man may not glorify himself in his presence. Few of you are wise according to the world; few are of high birth; few have many talents: and yet he has chosen you for this great work, that you may glorify him by your deeds and words through the entire universe." He sent them, two and two, to the different provinces of Italy, keeping Silvester, who was a priest, to accompany himself.

In 1212 Francis returned to Assisi. The clergy and people of the city came out to meet him, singing hymns and canticles. But he referred all this glory to God. In the same year he preached the Lent at Assisi, and a great number of his fellow-townspeople placed themselves under his spiritual guidance; among others, St. Clare, the glorious foundress of the Order of Poor Clares.

"It is impossible," says our late Holy Father Leo XIII, "to describe the enthusiasm with which the multitudes flocked to St. Francis. . . . In the largest cities, as in the smallest towns, it was a common occurrence for men of every state of life to come and beg of him to be admitted to his rule. Such were the reasons for which the saint determined to institute the Brotherhood of the Third Order, which was to admit all ranks, all ages, both sexes, and yet in no way necessitate the rupture of family or social ties. For its rules require the members only to obey God and his Church, to avoid factions and quarrels, and in no way to defraud their neighbor; to take up arms only for the defence of their religion and their country; to be moderate in food and clothing; to shun luxury; and to abstain from the dangerous seductions of dances and plays.

"It is easy to understand what immense advantages must have flowed from an institution of this kind, as salutary in itself as it was adapted to the times. . . . The associates of the Third Order always displayed as much courage as piety in the defence of the Catholic religion; and if their virtues were objects of hatred to the wicked, they never lacked the approbation of the good and wise, which is the greatest and only desirable honor. . . . Our predecessor Gregory IX publicly praised their faith and courage; nor

did he hesitate to shelter them with his authority, and to call them, as a mark of honor, soldiers of Christ, new Maccabees. . . .

"Domestic peace, incorrupt morality, gentleness of behavior, the legitimate use and preservation of private wealth, civilization, and social stability spring, as from a root, from the Franciscan Order: and it is in a great measure to St. Francis that Europe owes these advantages. . . . Amid so many and so mighty troubles at the present day, . . . you see clearly that no slight hope of relief may be fairly grounded on the restitution of the Franciscan institutions to their primitive condition. For were they to flourish, faith and piety and all Christian virtue would easily flourish. . . . Wherefore, as we have in former times ever had a special interest in the Third Order of Franciscans, so now, being called by God's great goodness to the Supreme Pontificate, as a most fitting opportunity has occurred, we exhort all Christians not to hesitate to enlist in this sacred army of Jesus Christ. . . . Do your best, therefore, that the people may know and really esteem the Third Order. So that all those that have the care of souls carefully teach what it is, how easily open to all, how abounding in great privileges for eternal salvation, how great utility, public and private, it gives promise of. . . . Then, at the end of seven centuries, Italy and the entire Christian world would see itself led back from disorder to peace, from ruin to safety, by the favor of the Saint of Assisi."

Pope Leo afterward addressed the following memorable words to the Tertiaries of Italy: "I will that the Third Order be widely spread: let us increase the ranks of the Third Order; let us labor unceasingly to that end. . . . I will that all may become Tertiaries; but, above all, I desire the Franciscan spirit."

One night, as the saint was praying for sinners, an angel appeared to him and bade him hasten to the church of St. Mary of the Angels, where our Lord Jesus Christ and his Blessed Mother awaited his coming. He immediately went to the church, and there he saw our Saviour in the midst of his angels, with his beloved Mother on his right hand. Francis fell down in lowly adoration, and poured out his heartfelt thanks for this great favor.

Then he heard the voice of our Divine Lord saying: "Francis, you and your children have a great zeal for the salvation of souls; you have been placed as a light to the world and as a support to the Church. Ask, then, whatever you will for the benefit and consolation of mankind and for my glory."

The saint humbly replied: "My Lord Jesus Christ, though I am but a miserable sinner, I beseech you grant that all who visit this church may receive a plenary indulgence for all their sins, after they have confessed to a priest. And I beseech the Blessed Virgin, your Mother, and the advocate of the human race, to intercede for me that I may obtain this grace."

Then our Lady inclined toward her Divine Son to ask the favor.

Our Blessed Lord replied: "Francis, you ask great things; but you shall receive still greater. I grant what you demand; but go to my Vicar, to whom I have given power to bind and loose on earth, and ask him to ratify what I now declare."

The next morning St. Francis repaired to Perugia to see Pope Honorius III. When admitted to an audience he addressed the Sovereign Pontiff, in all simplicity, thus: "Holy Father, some years since I repaired a small church in your dominions. I beseech your Holiness to grant that those who visit it may obtain an indulgence without making any offering."

The Pope replied: "Francis, you ask a great favor, and one contrary to the usual custom."

"Holy Father," answered the saint, "I do not ask this in my own name, but in the name of Jesus Christ."

Then the Pope uttered these words three times: "It is my will to grant what you desire." But he added: "I grant this indulgence in perpetuity, but only on one day during the year."

At these words, Francis, having received the Pope's blessing, prepared to depart.

"Simple man," cried out Honorius, "where are you going, and what proof have you of what has been granted to you?"

"Holy Father," replied the saint, "your word is sufficient

for me. If this indulgence is the work of God, he will make it manifest. Jesus Christ will be the notary, his Blessed Mother the parchment, and the angels the witnesses."

Two years afterward, in the month of January, St. Francis, assailed by the tempter, rolled himself on a bush of long and sharp thorns till the blood poured out from every vein. He then beheld the thorny bush covered with red and white roses. Angels also appeared to him and said, "Francis, hasten to the church, where you will find Jesus and his Blessed Mother."

The saint arose. Gathering twelve roses of each color, he went to the church, and there, prostrate before Jesus and Mary, he asked our Divine Redeemer to fix the day for the indulgence. Our Lord then told him that it should be from the Vespers of the day on which St. Peter was delivered from his chains until the Vespers of the next day.

This indulgence of Portiuncula has been repeatedly attacked by Protestants, but what injury have they done to the divine favor? Year after year during the last six centuries, the Sovereign Pontiffs Alexander IV, Martin IV, Boniface VIII, Clement V, John XXII, Benedict XI, Sixtus IV, Leo X, Paul V, and Urban VIII have recognized and authorized it. Men eminent for piety, learning, and eloquence, as St. Antonine, St. Bernardine, Bellarmine, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and a host of others, have undertaken its defence. The Christian people flock in crowds every year, not only to this sanctuary, but to every Franciscan church in the world —to which this great favor has been extended, since 1622, by Gregory XI—professing their faith in this indulgence, in spite of the scoffs of men who are as ignorant of the merciful designs of God as they are of the wants of the human soul.

Love so transformed the heart of Francis (as the saint himself tells us), that he saw all God's creatures as so many steps to raise his mind and soul to God. He gives to the sun, to the stars, even to animals, the sweet name of brother and sister; he invites them all to praise the goodness of their common Master, and to testify their gratitude to him. "When Francis," says St. Bonaventure,

" came to a place where a number of birds of all kinds had perched, he ran toward them with joy, and saluted them as if they were rational creatures. They all listened and turned toward him; then he preached to them, and as he spoke the birds testified their joy, stretched forward their necks, clapped their wings, and opened their beaks, steadfastly looking at the servant of God. After he had given them his blessing, the whole flock flew away."

The holy man was particularly fond of sheep; he kept for years one which used to attend church and showed its respect for the sacred mysteries.

One day, when walking beside one of the lagoons of Venice with another brother, the saint heard a number of birds singing among the rushes. He immediately said to his companion, " Our brothers the birds have begun to praise their Creator. Come, let us also praise God by chanting the divine office." But the birds sang so loud that Francis and his companion could not hear each other. Then the saint said, " My brothers the birds, cease your songs till we have finished our office "; and at once they ceased singing, and remained silent while Francis and his companion recited the office.

Birds, hares, and even wolves found a friend and protector in him. We here give the charming legend of the wolf of Gubbio. A savage wolf was the terror of the inhabitants of the suburbs of Gubbio. The dreadful havoc and loss of life caused by this creature excited the compassion of Francis. He resolved to go, accompanied by some of his brothers, to meet the wolf. He soon saw that his companions were filled with fear, so he left them behind, and went alone along the path which led to the brute's lair. The wolf, seeing Francis, sprang toward him with jaws wide open, ready to devour him.

The saint stepped forward to meet the fierce animal, and, making the sign of the cross, said, " Come here, brother wolf. In the name of Christ, I order you to do no harm to me or to others." Meek as a lamb, the wolf at once came and lay down at the feet of Francis.

The holy man continued: " Brother wolf, you have caused

terrible ruin in this country. Not content with devouring animals, you have had the audacity to kill men created in the image and likeness of God. You deserve, brother wolf, as a murderer, to be put to death for your many crimes. Now I know it is hunger that makes you do this, and I require you to promise that if the people give you enough to eat for the future, you will not do them any more harm."

The wolf bowed his head as a sign of consent.

"Give me proof that you will keep your promise," said the saint, stretching out his hand.

The wolf, in answer, lifted up his paw and placed it in the hand of St. Francis, and then followed him to the public square at Gubbio. For the two years it lived afterward, it came every day to Gubbio for food, which was joyfully given it by the inhabitants.

St. Francis's zeal for souls inspired him with the thought of going to the East to join the Crusaders. He desired to convert the Mohammedans, or to die the death of a martyr at their hands.

On arriving at Damietta, then besieged by the Crusaders, the saint found that no one could pass from one camp to the other except at the peril of his life, as the Sultan had promised a reward to any one bringing him the head of a Christian. Francis and a companion, undaunted by these threats, went boldly toward the town, saying solemnly: "For though I should walk in the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me." They were taken prisoners by the Mohammedan sentries, and, having been loaded with chains, were led before the Sultan. He asked them, in a fury, why they had entered his kingdom.

The saint answered: "I come, on the part of the Most High God, to preach the way of salvation to you and your people, and to announce to them the truth of the Gospel."

Then Francis spoke of the great truths of our holy religion with such divine eloquence and conviction that the Sultan listened to him with pleasure and wished him to remain in his dominions.

Francis replied: "If you and your people will be converted, I will willingly remain with you. But if you hesitate to give up

the law of Mohammed for that of Jesus Christ, order a great fire to be made, and I will walk through it with your priests; you can then judge which is the true faith."

The Sultan answered that he did not think that any of the priests of Mohammed would accept such a proposal.

"Well, then," said the saint, "if you will promise me, for yourself and for your subjects, to embrace the faith of Jesus Christ when you see that the flames do not touch me, I will go alone into the fire."

The Sultan would not agree to this proposal, and St. Francis, seeing that his preaching was useless, and that his desire for martyrdom could not be satisfied, returned to the Christian camp. The Sultan, however, in private begged of Francis to pray that our Lord would give him light to know the true faith; and, many years after, the saint appeared to two of his brethren in Syria, and ordered them to go to the Sultan to administer baptism to him.

This journey of Francis to the Holy Land was the cause of the many conquests made by his order for the faith in the holy places during the last six hundred years. What all the power of Europe was not able to effect, the humble children of the saint have achieved in the preservation of the holy places since that memorable visit of the Seraphic Patriarch to the Holy Land.

St. Francis had a supreme love for the Church. "The Mother of all Churches," said the saint, "is the Holy Roman Church. I shall go and commend my brothers to her. Under her protection, nothing bad can happen to our order. Holy Church will be a jealous upholder of the glory of our poverty. She will preserve the bonds of charity and peace unimpaired among us."

Having asked for a papal protector of his order, he said to the Pope: "We fear and we blush to come knocking at the door of the Supreme Head of the Church. I therefore pray your Holiness to give us the Lord of Ostia in your place, that we may have recourse to him in our needs; not, however, interfering in anything with the preëminence of your Holiness, from whom all the strength of the mystical Body emanates, and all power is derived."

In the rule he enjoins that, being always "subject and submissive at the feet of the same holy Church, and steadfast in the Catholic faith, we may observe the poverty and humility of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the holy Gospel, as we have firmly promised."

We have already seen how Francis went to Rome to get his rule approved by the Pope, and how he got the famous indulgence of the Portiuncula, given by Jesus Christ himself, ratified by the same infallible authority. "For," said the saint, "without his consent and approval, nothing can be stable or good in matters of faith, or in religious life."

"The burning love of St. Francis for the Most Holy Sacrament," says St. Bonaventure, "seemed to consume the very marrow of his bones." In his letters and instructions, with words of fire, he beseeches the entire world to show every possible reverence to this mystery of Divine Love. "I conjure you, my brethren," he says, "embracing your feet with all the love of which I am capable, I implore you to show all respect and honor to the Body and Blood of Christ, by whom we have been reconciled to God the Father Almighty, and peace has been established in heaven and on earth. And yet how unworthily the Sacred Body of our Lord is treated; how it is left in unbecoming places, irreverently carried, disrespectfully received, and carelessly administered! Shall we not grieve over these outrages, remembering how lovingly he gives himself to us, how he leaves himself with us, and how we touch him and receive him every day in Holy Communion?"

He then cries out in an ecstasy of love and gratitude: "Incomprehensible greatness! O inconceivable goodness! O excess of humility! that the Sovereign of the universe, God, and the Son of God, should descend so low as to hide himself under the species of bread. Reflect, my brethren, on the abasement of God; pour forth your hearts in his presence; humble yourself before him, that he who gives himself to you without reserve may take full possession of you."

We can truly say that Francis practised and taught all the

devotions of our day for the most holy mystery—frequent communion (at least for that age), aid to poor churches, visits, spiritual communion, love of the Most Holy Sacrifice, and the like. St. Francis communicated often, " and so devoutly," says St. Bonaventure, " as to move others to devotion."

" Wherever he found a deserted church," says the same Seraphic Doctor, " especially in the country, he used to sweep and clean it, and adorn it by every means in his power. Fearing that Hosts might be wanting for the celebration of the Most Holy Sacrifice, or that they might not be carefully prepared, he used to make great numbers himself, and would take them to churches that required them. This care he extended to everything that concerned the Sacred Mysteries."

He earnestly exhorted his brethren to meditate unceasingly on the Sacred Passion. " Have always before your eyes," he used to say, " the way of humility, poverty, and the Holy Cross, by which our Saviour Jesus Christ redeemed us." Like the great apostle, he saw nothing on earth but Jesus Christ, and him crucified.

" My soul," he cried out, " is so fully occupied with the consideration of the Passion of my Lord, that, were I to live until the end of time, I should require no other subject for my thoughts."

When reproached for the tears he continually shed while meditating on this subject, he answered, " I weep for the sufferings of my Lord Jesus Christ, and I ought not to be ashamed to weep for them before the whole world." This love of Jesus crucified obtained for him the signal honor of bearing on his body the Stigmata of his Saviour.

St. Bonaventure thus describes this wonderful prodigy: " On the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, while praying in the morning on the side of Mount Alvernia, St. Francis beheld a Seraph, having six wings inflamed with the most resplendent fire, descending to him from the height of heaven. And as he flew with great swiftness toward the man of God, there appeared between the wings the form of One crucified, having his hands and feet stretched out and fixed to the cross. When he beheld this vision

he marvelled greatly, and his heart was filled with mingled joy and sorrow; he at once understood that he was to be transformed into Christ crucified, not by the martyrdom of the flesh, but by the fire of love. The vision, disappearing, left behind it a marvellous fervor in his heart, and a no less wonderful impression on his flesh; for nails began to appear in his hands and in his feet, and in his right side a red wound, as though it had been pierced with a lance; and from this wound blood often flowed."

St. Bonaventure adds: "The Sacred Stigmata were seen by more than fifty of the brethren, and also by St. Clare. The Supreme Pontiff Alexander, when preaching to the people in the presence of many of the friars, of whom I was one, affirmed that, in the lifetime of the saint, he had seen the Sacred Stigmata with his own eyes." The Church commemorates this great favor, on the 17th of September, by a special festival in honor of the Stigmata of St. Francis.

In order that the name of the Lord, not only in thought, but in speech and writing, should be treated with due honor, St. Francis obliged his brethren, whenever they found any writings with his Holy Name, to lay them up carefully in some fitting place, lest perchance the Sacred Name thereon might be trodden under foot. In his last testament he says: "Whenever I find his most Holy Name or written words in unseemly places, I collect them, and I wish that they may be gathered up and honorably kept." He recited the canonical hours with the greatest reverence and devotion. When travelling, he always stopped to say them, standing erect and bareheaded, never omitting this holy practice, however inclement the weather or abundant the rain. For he said: "If we endeavor to be at rest when we take the food of the body, which will soon be the food of worms, with what peace and tranquillity should not the soul take the food of life, which is the Word of God."

St. Bonaventure tells us that St. Francis had an extraordinary devotion and love for the Blessed Virgin. He calls her his "Lady and his Queen, in whom is all fullness of grace and every sort of

THE SACRED STIGMATA OF ST. FRANCIS

FROM THE PAINTING BY LAURENT DE LAHIRE

good; the Palace, the Temple, the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is as sweet as she is amiable."

"When I say, 'Hail, Mary,'" said he, "Heaven smiles, the angels rejoice, the world exults, hell trembles, and the devil takes to flight."

He made her patroness of the whole order, and he fasted every year, from the Feast of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, in her honor. The little church of Portiuncula was especially dear to him as being dedicated to her Immaculate Heart. Here he received untold favors through her intercession; here she interceded for him and his order with her Divine Son. Here, also, she appeared to him in the midst of angelic choirs, and obtained for him the great indulgence of Portiuncula. As early as the first General Chapter, St. Francis ordained that a solemn Mass should be sung every Saturday, in her honor, in all the convents of the order.

The saint enjoined on all his religious of the First and Second Orders, and on all the brothers and sisters of the Third Order, the great duty of charity toward the holy souls. In the first rule he says: "The clerics shall perform the Divine Office for the living and the dead, . . . and for the departed brethren recite the *De Profundis* with *Pater Noster*. The lay brothers shall say for the dead seven *Paters*, etc." In the rule of St. Clare he prescribed that "the sisters who can read are bound to recite the Office of the Dead." In the rule of the Third Order he enjoined: "Within a week after the death of any member, the brothers who are priests shall say one Mass for the repose of the soul. Those who know the Psalter shall each say fifty psalms, and those who cannot read shall say as many *Pater Nosters*, adding at the end of each, *Requiem æternam*. Besides this, they shall have three Masses celebrated every year for the brothers and sisters, living and dead; those who know the Psalter shall say it, and others shall not fail to recite one hundred *Pater Nosters*, adding at the end of each, *Requiem æternam*."

"We ought," says St. Francis, "to confess all our sins to the priest, that we may receive the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, because whoever does not eat his flesh and drink his Blood

cannot enter the kingdom of God." In the first rule he strictly commands his children to " confess their sins to priests of the order," and " if they cannot do this, let them confess to any other discreet and Catholic priests; believing firmly that, from whatever priest they receive penance and absolution, their sins will be undoubtedly pardoned; for to priests alone is given the power of binding and loosing."

When he felt his end drawing nigh, Francis sent for Brother Benedict of Piratro, to whom he said: " Priest of God, write down the blessing I now give to all my brothers in the order, and to all those who shall ever belong to it, until the end of the world. As my weakness hinders me from speaking, I will declare, in a few words, my will and intentions with regard to my brothers, present and future, as my blessing and testament which they must never forget. Let my brothers love one another, as I have loved, and do love, them. Let them always cherish the Lady Poverty, and never swerve from her laws; let them be ever faithful and submissive to the prelates and priests of the Holy Roman Church; and may the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost always bless and protect them." He was then at Siena, under the care of a distinguished oculist, as his eyesight was nearly lost from incessant weeping for the sufferings of his Saviour.

St. Francis now requested his brethren to carry him to Assisi, that he might have the consolation of breathing his last sigh where he had received the grace of spiritual life. He was accordingly carried to our Lady of the Angels by a strong guard from Assisi. His patience in his sufferings was admirable; he called his pains his " dear sisters."

Once a brother said to him, when suffering more than usual, " Brother, pray to God that he would deal more gently with thee, for it seems to me that his hand is heavy on thee."

The holy man cried out, " Brother, if I did not know thy simplicity, I would never more allow thee near me "; and casting himself on the ground, he exclaimed, " I thank thee, O Lord my God, for these my pains, and I beseech thee to increase them a hun-

dredfold; for the fulfilment of thy will is my greatest consolation in this world."

He asked his brethren to read to him the history of the Passion, saying: "Nothing can give me greater pleasure than to hear again and again what my beloved Master suffered for me."

When dying, the father guardian, who knew his love of holy poverty, offered him an old habit and cord, and said: "Brother, I bring you these as alms for the love of God; receive them with the spirit of holy obedience." This the saint did joyfully, showing to the end his great love for his spouse, holy poverty. He then cast himself on the ground, and commanded his brethren to leave him thus, after his death, for the time that it would take a man to walk a mile.

The hour of his departure having come, Francis spoke to his children at length on patience, poverty, and faithful obedience to the Holy Roman Church. And extending his hands in the form of a cross over all the brethren who were around him, he blessed all his children, present and absent, in the name of Jesus crucified. Then he added: "Farewell, my children! Abide in the fear of the Lord, and ever persevere therein. And when temptation or trouble assails you, say, 'Blessed are they that persevere unto the end.' And now I go to God, to whose grace I commend you all." When he had said these words he asked his brethren to read a chapter of the Gospel of St. John; after which he recited the Hundred and Forty-first Psalm till he came to the verse, "The just wait for me, until thou reward me." All these mysteries being now fulfilled in him, his holy soul, being set free, was absorbed in the Divine Glory. "Many of his brothers," says St. Bonaventure, a contemporary, "saw his soul, like a brilliant star, borne to heaven on a white cloud."

Such was the death of the great servant of God, St. Francis the Seraphic, on the 4th of October, 1226, in the forty-fifth year of his age, the twentieth from his conversion, and the eighteenth from the foundation of the order. At the moment of his death, Brother Augustine, Provincial of Lavaro, being in his agony, cried out aloud, "Wait for me, Father; wait for me! I am going with

you." When those present asked him to whom he thus spoke, he answered, "Do you not see Father Francis going to heaven?" At the same time the saint appeared to the Bishop of Assisi, and said, "Behold, I leave the world to go to heaven."

Now were seen the nails which had been wondrously formed out of his flesh. On his side also appeared the wound like to the wound on our Lord's side. The nails were as black as iron. The wound on his side was red and rounded, resembling a beautiful rose. All the rest of the body, which had been dark by nature and also by reason of his continual infirmities, was now of a dazzling whiteness, and his limbs were as soft and flexible as those of a child.

As soon as the saint's death was known, the people of Assisi hastened in crowds to our Lady of the Angels to examine the wounds of the Stigmata, and to satisfy their devotion by touching the holy body. Next morning, a vast multitude, with lighted torches and branches in their hands, accompanied the sacred remains to Assisi, singing hymns and canticles of praise. As the procession passed the church of St. Damian, where St. Clare lived, the body was exposed to the veneration of that holy virgin and her sisters. St. Clare tried in vain to detach one of the miraculous nails; she then steeped a linen cloth in the blood oozing from the wound in his side. The body was carried with reverence to St. George's church, where St. Francis had been baptized, where he had first preached, and where he now found his first resting-place after death. He had expressed a wish to be buried in the Colle d'Inferno, or hill where criminals were executed. But this humble desire could not be fulfilled until the people of Assisi had erected a suitable monument over this place of ignominy. Many miracles having been wrought through his intercession, the blessed Francis was canonized on the 16th of June, 1228, by the Sovereign Pontiff, Gregory IX.

Francis of Assisi is emphatically the saint of the people. To this day his name, his life, and his sufferings live in the hearts of all devout Catholics. His wonderful life was filled with miraculous signs of divine favor. "Such miracles," said Pope Leo XIII,

" worthy rather of the songs of angels than of the lips of men, show us sufficiently how great was this man, and how worthy that God should choose him to bring back his contemporaries to Christian ways. . . . It is manifest that from this one man a host of benefits has accrued to the civil commonwealth. But inasmuch as his spirit, so thoroughly and so preëminently Christian, is wondrously suited to all times and all places, no one can doubt that the Franciscan institutions will be of the greatest benefit in this our age."

BOOK VII

CATHOLIC TRUTH *VERSUS* PROTESTANT ERROR

CHAPTER XXVIII

CARDINAL MANNING, CONVERT TO THE FAITH, ON THE CHURCH'S INFALLIBILITY [1]

Infallibility promised by Christ to his Church—The means promised by our Divine Lord to render his Church infallible—The faith of the ancient Church relating to the matter—The distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals examined—The first part of the distinction renders the reformers and their respective churches inexcusable—The second part of the distinction contradicts the Word of God—It gives the lie to the Nicene Creed—It destroys all certainty in matters of faith—It renders all church authority precarious—The Church in communion with the see of Rome has alone a just title to infallibility.

AS the divine wisdom has permitted many sacred truths in Holy Writ to be wrapped up in dark figures, or enigmatical expressions, both to excite our industry in searching, and exercise our faith in believing, when they are explained to us by sufficient authority; so there are others so very clear and intelligible, that their meaning is obvious, and lies open to every sincere and

[1] Henry Edward Manning was born at Totteridge, Hertfordshire, on July 15, 1808. He was the youngest son of William Manning, a West India merchant. The youthful Manning entered Harrow in 1822, and Balliol College, Oxford, in 1827, where Charles Wordsworth was his tutor, and William Ewart Gladstone, England's future "Grand Old Man," an associate. He was made a fellow of Merton, Oxford, in 1832, and was ordained Episcopal rector of Woollavington-cum-Graffham in 1833. Manning was married on November 7, 1833, and his wife died on July 24, 1837. In 1840 he was created Archdeacon of Chichester. He took no part in the movement which resulted in the departure of Ward and Newman from the Church of England, but continued a leader of the High-Church party until 1848. In May, 1848, he visited Rome, and his religious convictions, which had hitherto been in the formative stage, became fixed forever during his stay at the centre of Christianity. On his return to England, Manning found himself in opposition to the established church. In April, 1850, he resigned his archdeaconry; and on June 14, 1851, he was ordained a priest of the Roman Catholic Church. In 1854 Father Manning was made a doctor of divinity by Pope Pius IX, and on March 31, 1857, he was installed as superior of the Congregation of the Oblates of St. Charles at Bayswater. On April 30, 1865, he succeeded Cardinal Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster, and was created cardinal on March 31, 1875. He was the author of "Unity of the Church" (1842), "Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost" (1865), "Temporal Power of the Pope" (1866), "England and Christendom" (1867), etc. Cardinal Manning died at Westminster on January 14, 1892.

unbiassed reader. Of this sort are many historical and moral tracts, both in the Old and the New Testament; and I dare confidently say that all the principal texts relating to the infallibility of the Church are of this nature.

The word of God teaches it in the plainest and strongest terms. The promises of Christ are not wrapped up in parables, or a prophetic language that requires deep searching to dive into it, but they are delivered in words so easy and intelligible, that any man, who makes it not his study to deceive himself, may understand them. The solemnity also of the circumstances wherein Christ made those sacred engagements to his Church is so remarkable, that they cannot but imprint an idea of some extraordinary favor bestowed upon her.

His first promise of protecting his Church against all the powers of darkness was addressed to St. Peter, in reward of that noble profession of his Divinity, "which neither flesh nor blood, but the Father which is in heaven had revealed unto him."[1] The other promises were made at his Last Supper, in that sermon which is, as it were, his last will and testament, every word whereof seems to be the overflowing of a heart filled with concern for his future Church. It was then that Christ unbosomed himself to his apostles as a friend or father; comforted them in their affliction for his approaching departure; and as a pledge of his unalterable love to his Church, bequeathed to them "the Spirit of Truth," to be her guide and teacher to the world's end. All which he ratified again a few moments before his ascension into heaven, when he gave his apostles their commission "to teach and baptize all nations," and encouraged them to undertake it with a promise of his perpetual assistance.[2]

I appeal, then, to the Word of God for the truth and justice of the cause which I have undertaken. The Word of God shall be the Judge between the Church of Rome and the reformed churches. It is by this rule I desire that this important cause may be decided. It is true, indeed, if I were to write against infidels,

[1] Matt. xvi. 17. [2] *Ibid.* xxviii. 20.

there would be need of other proofs, because the authority of Scripture would be questioned by them. But, since the cause depending is not between Christians and infidels, but between Christians and Christians, who all believe the Scriptures to have been written by divine inspiration, and to contain nothing but undoubted truth, there can be no exception made against the arms I intend to make use of in defence of my cause. Neither can I be accused of "running round in a circle," as is the usual objection; because the divine authority of Scripture is as a *postulatum* which I take for granted, and use it as an argument *ad hominem*. And, therefore, if I make it appear that the doctrine of infallibility is the doctrine of the Gospel, the doctrine of Jesus Christ, who is truth itself: then I shall have reason to hope that all those whom neither interest nor passion can hinder from sincerely desiring to save their souls, will make it their endeavor to seek the truth in that Church where it is infallibly taught.

First, then, let us consider our Saviour's words to St. Peter, recorded in the sixteenth chapter of St. Matthew. I give them the first place, as being the clearest and strongest proof of an infallible Church. For they contain an absolute and unconditional promise; there being no condition either expressed or hinted at in the whole text. It is a promise delivered in such clear and strong terms, that, without straining the text in a very notorious manner, it can bear no other sense than that in which the Roman Catholic Church has always understood it.

The occasion of this promise is also very remarkable, as I have already hinted. St. Peter's name till then was Simon Bar-jona. But God having preordained him to be the chief pillar of his Church, enlightened him in a particular manner, with a distinct faith of the divinity of Christ, whereof he made this solemn profession: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God."[1] Hereupon our Saviour dignified him with a title, suitable both to the firmness of his faith and the eminent station he was to hold, and gave him the name of Cephas, or Peter; both which signify a rock.

[1] Matt. xvi. 16.

And then, as a further mark of distinction, he thus addresses to him the promise I speak of. "Thou art Peter [that is, a Rock], and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."[1]

It is not my business here to examine what prerogative this gave to St. Peter, in being alone called the Rock upon which the Church was to be built. I shall only make my reflections upon the promise itself by which Christ had engaged his word that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church" that is built upon it: which, if it be not a proof of an infallible Church, I own I am at a loss to find words clear and strong enough to express it. What other meaning can we give to the words of Christ that will bear any connection with their obvious and natural signification? That they contain a promise is plain. That the promise which they contain is made to the Church is no less plain; and since all God's promises have a relation to some favor, it remains only to consider what this favor is.

First, then, Christ promises "to build his Church upon a Rock." What does this mean? Is it probable that Christ, who foresaw everything that was to happen, would have told St. Peter that his Church should be built upon a rock, if he had foreseen its future fall? Had he no design that the Rock upon which his Church was to be built should be a firm and lasting foundation to it? Or did he act by chance, and without end or design? But Christ himself has answered all these questions in the following words: "I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock."[2] Whence it is plain that Christ, by promising that his Church should be built upon a Rock, intended to assure us that its foundation should be so strong, so deeply laid, that it should stand in spite of all storms, oppositions, or any efforts whatever to make it fall. And, therefore, to prevent the very possibility of all but wilful mistakes, in the second part of the promise he explains himself, and declares

[1] Matt. xvi. 18.

[2] *Ibid.* vii. 24, 25.

positively that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Which words contain two things. First, they imply a general prediction of what should happen to the Church from the efforts and malice of her enemies who should oppose or endeavor to corrupt her holy doctrine. And, secondly, a positive assurance that all their strength and malice, which our Saviour calls "the gates of hell," shall never prevail against her.

The prediction has been fully verified. The Jews, the professed enemies of Christ, were the first champions of Satan who declared themselves openly, and made many furious assaults upon his Church. These were soon followed by several apostate Christians, as the Ebionites, the Nicolaites, the Corinthians, and many others, who conspired together to corrupt the purity of her doctrine. But the ten bloody persecutions raised by the heathen emperors in the first three centuries aimed at nothing less than to extirpate the Christian religion and destroy the Church, root and branch.

When these storms ceased, and the Church was delivered from foreign enemies, her own bowels again rose up against her, in so violent a manner as seemed to threaten her utter ruin. Arius and his followers, supported by the secular power of Christian emperors, and a great number of apostate bishops, made a furious war upon her for many years together. All the means that artifice or malice could suggest were employed to undermine the very foundations of religion. The most zealous Catholic bishops were either murdered or imprisoned or sent into banishment; so that, the wolves being let in among the flock, everything seemed to tend to the utter extirpation of the Catholic faith. This was the state of the Church in those turbulent times; and her condition has in some measure been the same from time to time, whenever the devil and his ministers made any new attempt upon the purity of her faith: as has happened almost in every age from the very infancy of the Church to this time downward.

So here we see the "powers of hell" have always been armed against the Church, and the prediction implied in the fore-mentioned text has been fully verified. But have we not as good security of

the effects of Christ's promises as for the event of his predictions? Is he not equally infallible when he promises blessings as when he foretells calamities and disasters? There can be no doubt of it. And, therefore, though the powers of darkness will never cease to make war upon the Church, their efforts will always be as vain as the winds and rain against a house that is built upon a rock. And as her faith has stood the shock, both against the united force of Jews and pagans, and the deceitful reasoning of Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Donatists, Pelagians, and others; so will it remain immovable and incorruptible to the world's end. And this is so manifest a truth, that to deny it we must either interpret the Scriptures backward, or give our Saviour flatly the lie. For if words retain their usual signification, we cannot charge the Church of Christ with error, even against any one, single article of faith, but we must draw this impious consequence from it, that he was either ignorant of the event of his promise, or unfaithful to it; and that after having in so solemn a manner engaged his sacred word to St. Peter that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against his Church," he has nevertheless delivered her up to the power of Satan, to be destroyed by him.

This consequence will appear undeniable if we consider the two following truths, namely: First, that faith is essential to the constitution of the Church; and, secondly, that heresy destroys faith. For it plainly follows hence, that if the whole Church falls into heresy, she is without faith, and is no more the Church she was before, than a man can continue to be a man without a soul. The Church of Christ (as I shall show hereafter) can only be that which believes wholly and entirely the doctrine that was taught by Christ and delivered to her by the apostles. If, therefore, she ever renounced any part of that doctrine, does it not follow that she then turned apostate? That she ceased from that moment to be the chaste Spouse of Christ? That "the gates of hell prevailed against her"? And that, by consequence, our Saviour, in permitting that to happen which he promised should not happen, was unfaithful to his word?

Again: Christ either foresaw that "the gates of hell should not prevail against his Church," or he foresaw it not. If not, then he promised he knew not what, which is blasphemy. But if he did foresee it, then (since his foresight was infallible in everything) the event must answer it infallibly; and so it must be infallibly true that the gates of hell never have prevailed, nor ever will prevail, against his Church.

In a word, I take this to be a demonstration. The gates of hell (according to Christ's own words) will never prevail against his Church; but if she falls into any error against faith, the gates of hell prevail against her; therefore she cannot fall into any error against faith. Therefore she is infallible in all matters of faith.

If it be asked how any congregation or society of men can be infallible, since all men (as the Psalmist says) are liars, that is, subject to errors, my answer is, that all men of themselves are certainly subject to errors, even in the most ordinary things; but much more in matters of faith, which are above human reason. And, therefore, if the infallibility of the Church was to depend upon the judgment, wit, or learning of men, it would have but a very weak foundation, and would be like "the house of the foolish man built upon the sand, which was overthrown by the winds and flood that beat upon it."[1] But our Saviour was not this foolish man: for he did not tell St. Peter that his Church should be built upon the sand, but that it should be built upon a rock, and that, therefore, "the gates of hell should not prevail against it"; and we cannot doubt but he has made good his words, and has found means to do it, notwithstanding the natural weakness and fallibility of the members whereof she was to be composed.

The means, then, by which this great work was to be brought about have no less their warrant and security from the Word of God, and promises of Christ, than the thing itself. If this be clearly made out, the evidence will be so full as to leave no room for any further dispute, unless it be for dispute's sake. We grant, then, that no human industry, wit, or learning, is sufficient to secure

[1] Matt. vii. 26.

the Church from falling into error, and that nothing can render her infallible but the assistance and direction of an Infallible Guide. But Christ has taken care to provide such a Guide for his Church—a guide of infinite wisdom—and has promised that this Guide shall "lead her into all truth," and remain with her "to the end of the world." All which stands recorded in the Gospels in such plain and express terms, that men must wilfully shut their eyes not to see it.

Our Saviour's words spoken to his apostles, and recorded by St. John in his fourteenth chapter, are these: "I will ask my Father, and he will send you another Comforter to abide with you for ever." [1] And soon after he informs them who this Comforter is to be, and to what end his Father will send him. "The Comforter [says Christ], which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." [2] This promise is again repeated in the sixteenth chapter, which contains a continuation of the same discourse. "I have yet many things to say unto you. But you cannot bear them now. However, when the Spirit of Truth is come, he will lead you into all truth." [3]

Here we have the means by which the Church of Christ is to be forever protected against the gates of hell, clearly and distinctly set down, namely: "The perpetual assistance of the Divine Spirit, teaching the Church, and leading her into all truth"; nay, and these means secured to her by him "to whom all power is given in heaven and earth." And who can suspect that Christ should ever abandon his Church, and suffer her to become a prey to her enemies, after the sacred engagement of so many promises to the contrary?

But if it be objected that all the fore-mentioned texts contain no more than a promise of the visible descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles, which was accomplished ten days after Christ's ascension into heaven, I answer that this cannot be. For though that be a part of the promise, it is not the whole. And, therefore,

[1] John xiv. 16. [2] *Ibid.* xiv. 26. [3] *Ibid.* xvi. 12.

as that part was fully performed, we cannot doubt but the other part will be so, too.

That it is not the whole promise is manifest, because one part of it says expressly that the Comforter, or Holy Ghost, shall abide with them "for ever"; which, though addressed to the apostles, as the whole sermon at our Saviour's Last Supper was, yet, like many other truths contained in it, could not regard their persons alone; for they were not to live "for ever"; but comprehended likewise all those who were to succeed them in after ages. And that this was the intent of our Saviour's promise appears clearly from his last words before his ascension, recorded by St. Matthew: "All power [says Christ] is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; . . . and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."[1] For in what manner was Christ to be always with them, since he was then upon the point of withdrawing from them his visible presence? It was, doubtless, by the invisible grace, assistance, and protection of the Divine Spirit. And since this is promised to continue "even to the consummation of the world," it explains the former words "for ever," and renders it manifest that the fore-mentioned texts are not to be limited to the apostles, but that the Church, throughout all ages, has a title to the promise which they contain.

Which truth is yet further confirmed from the end or motive for which the promise was made. Now this was no other than that the Church should be guided into all truth. And has not the Church stood in need of being guided into all truth in every age, as much as in the time of the apostles? Surely, rather more. Because the further we are removed from the source of any truth which depends upon authority more than natural reason, the harder it is to trace our way back to it. And, therefore, if the divine assistance was necessary to guide the Church into all truth even in those happy times when the apostles themselves, who had been taught in the

[1] Matt. xxviii. 18–20.

school of Christ, instructed her either by word of mouth or by their writings, it cannot be denied but this assistance has been at least fully as needful to her in after ages, when the words and writings of the apostles, by the distance of time, could not avoid sharing the fate of other authors, of being liable to misinterpretations, false glosses, changes, and corruptions; unless the same Infallible Guide which preserved the Church from error in her infancy, had continued ever since to conduct her in the paths of truth.

What reason, then, is there to think that Christ should withdraw his Divine Spirit from the Church at a time when his assistance was most needful to her? Or that the engagement of an unlimited and unconditional promise should ever become void while the sole end and motive of it was not only fully subsisting, but rather more pressingly calling upon it than at first? Or must we accuse Christ of inconstancy, and say he was less tender of his Church in process of time than when he espoused her first, and sealed the contract with his precious blood? If so, then St. Paul made choice of a very improper pattern to set before the Ephesian husbands, in exhorting them "to love their wives as Christ loved his Church."[1] But St. Paul remembered these words of Hosea: "I will espouse thee to me for ever—I will espouse thee to me in faith";[2] and, therefore, hazarded nothing in recommending the love of Christ to his Church as a perfect pattern of a constant and unchangeable love; of which it would come very short if he should ever leave her to be corrupted and adulterated with false doctrine, as Protestants say he has.

But St. Paul foresaw no such change. He doubted not but Christ would be forever faithful to his Spouse, and, as the most effectual pledge of his love, "present her to himself without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing."[3] He therefore calls the Church "the pillar and ground of truth,"[4] which would be flatly false if she were capable of teaching anything contrary to God's revealed word. For the same reason, Christ himself has declared that "he who will not hear the Church shall be reputed as a heathen and

[1] Eph. v. 25. [2] Hos. ii. 19, 20. [3] Eph. v. 27. [4] 1 Tim. iii. 15.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN

FROM THE PAINTING BY REMBRANDT

"A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among robbers, who also stripped him, and having wounded him, went away, leaving him half dead. And it happened that a certain priest went down the same way: and seeing him, he passed by. In like manner, also, a Levite, when he was near the place, and saw him, passed by. But a certain Samaritan, being on his journey, came near him: and seeing him, was moved with compassion; and going up to him, bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine: and setting him upon his own beast, brought him to an inn, and took care of him."

a publican." [1] And can any man deserve these infamous characters for not hearing a Church that shall teach false doctrine? Finally, for the same reason, Christ has pronounced that "he who believes shall be saved, and he who believes not shall be damned." [2] But what is it we are bound to believe under pain of eternal damnation? It is, doubtless, the doctrine of that Church which Christ established on earth: for there can be no other true one. And is it possible that Christ should oblige mankind, under pain of eternal damnation, to believe a Church which he foresaw would seduce them in process of time? Shall a man be damned for not believing a seducer?

This implies a contradiction to another part of Christ's own doctrine, who expressly commands us to "beware of false prophets." [3] For if we are bound to beware of them, and yet the Church herself may turn false prophet and mislead us; then we are both commanded to beware of her, and at the same time threatened with eternal damnation if we refuse to believe her. What strange stuff is this! What incoherence do men run themselves into when they once abandon the truth? But Christ, in commanding us to beware of false prophets, has set a mark of infamy upon all broachers of new doctrine, to distinguish them from his Church, which, therefore, he commands us to believe under pain of eternal damnation; and by laying this command upon us, he showed plainly that it was his intention to establish an Infallible Church upon earth: a Church that should be a safe and unerring guide to those who followed her doctrine: finally, a Church that should be taught and guided by the Spirit of Truth, even unto the end of the world.

Thus we see the many sacred testimonies upon which the belief of an Infallible Church is founded. I know very well that no text of Holy Scripture is so clear, but persons of much wit and little sincerity may find interpretations to perplex it, or set it in a false light. The true sense of it may be eluded by precarious distinctions, or perverted by false glosses: as scarce any man can express himself so clearly, but wit and malice may put a misconstruction upon

[1] Matt. xviii. 17. [2] Mark xvi. 16. [3] Matt. vii. 15.

his words. But the question is not whether the texts I have produced may, with some pain and study, be interpreted otherwise than the Roman Catholic Church has always understood them; but whether, in their natural, obvious, and literal sense, they do not lead an unbiassed reader to the idea and belief of an Infallible Church? This certainly is a point which deserves to be taken seriously into consideration by all sincere lovers of truth.

Now, then, let us suppose that the contradictories of the texts I have quoted were found in Holy Writ. As, for instance, suppose our Saviour had said to St. Peter, "I will not build my Church upon a rock, and the gates of hell shall prevail against it." Suppose he had said to his apostles, "I will not be with you unto the end of the world. I will not send the Holy Ghost to abide with you for ever. He shall not teach you all things, nor lead you into all truth." Finally, suppose St. Paul had positively declared "that the Church is not the pillar and ground of truth." Would not all men of sound sense have concluded from such texts that there is no such thing as an Infallible Church on earth? They certainly would; because the obvious and natural meaning of them is so plain that it is impossible not to draw that consequence from them. Now, if one part of two contradictories cannot but force a man of an unbiassed judgment to conclude against the doctrine of infallibility, the other part is surely of equal force, to oblige him to conclude in favor of it. So that it is nothing to the purpose whether Protestants can, or cannot, strain the texts I have produced from their obvious and natural meaning; but it is very much to the purpose to consider whether they can bring any evidence from Scripture to disprove the infallibility of the Church, of equal strength and clearness to the texts I have brought to prove it. For if they cannot—as I am very sure they cannot—then it is manifest that the Word of God, and by consequence the truth, is on the Roman Catholic side, and against them.

I shall conclude this chapter with some quotations from the ancient fathers, to convince the reader that the belief of an infallible Church was the primitive faith; and that those great lights of

the Christian Church understood the texts I have quoted as Roman Catholics now do.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century, that is, just before the pretended reformation, the article of infallibility was believed and professed by the whole Catholic Church. And the Church of England, in her homily concerning the peril of idolatry, third part (of which we shall have more hereafter), tells us that Popery had then been the religion of whole Christendom for eight hundred years and more. This brings the doctrine of infallibility, which is an essential part of Popery, as high as the seventh century. Here, then, Protestants are obliged to show in which of the preceding ages this doctrine was first broached and regarded by the Church as a novelty. For if they cannot, they must confess it to be derived from the apostles themselves.

But I shall save them this fruitless labor by showing that it was taught in the primitive ages. The Church of England has received the first four general councils (act. 1 Eliz., c. 1), the first of which was held A.D. 325, and the last of them A.D. 451. Now let us see whether these councils, which were the representatives of the Catholic Church, were not held to be infallible in their decisions of faith. St. Gregory (Epist. 24) speaks thus of all four together: "I do profess to reverence the first four councils, as I reverence the four first books of the Gospel." And I presume St. Gregory believed the Gospels to be infallible in their doctrine. St. Leo (Epist. 73) says: "The Council of Chalcedon was assembled by the Holy Ghost." St. Cyril (Epist. ad Anast.) writes thus of the Council of Ephesus: "How can it be doubted that Christ did preside in that holy and great council?" And St. Athanasius (ad Episc. Afric.) says: "The word of God by the Nicene Council does remain for ever." This, certainly, is the language of persons believing the Church to be infallible in the decisions of her representatives, the general councils. Let us now see what the fathers have written of the Church in general.

St. Irenæus, who lived in the age immediately after Christ and his apostles, has the following words (lib. iii, c. 4): "Truth

is not to be sought from others, which you have easily from the Church; with whom the apostles have fully deposited all truth; that whosoever desires it, may have from it the living waters."

This cannot be said of a Church that is capable of leading her children into errors; for a Church that can err has not all truth deposited with her.

St. Cyprian, who lived in the third century, writes thus: "Christ, in the Gospel, when his disciples went away from him as he was speaking, turning to the twelve, said: 'What! will you also leave me?' Peter answered him: 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe, and have known, that thou art the Son of the living God.' Peter speaks there, upon whom the Church was built, declaring, in the name of the Church, that though great numbers of such stubborn and self-willed people as will not submit, become deserters, yet the Church will never fall from Christ: which Church is the people united to the priest, and the flock following their pastor."[1]

Again (Lib. de Unit. Eccl.): "The Church, having received the light of Christ, spreads its rays through the whole world. Yet it is one light which is thus diffused. Neither is the unity of the body at all injured by it. By her fertility, her branches reach over the earth, and every place is watered by her copious streams; yet there is but one head and one fountain, one mother rich in her numerous issue. By her fruitfulness we are born; we are nourished with her milk, and we are enlivened by her spirit. The Spouse of Christ cannot be an adulteress; she is uncorrupt and pure. She knows but one house, and with a chaste modesty secures the sanctity of one chamber. She it is that preserves us for heaven; and gives to her children, whom she has brought forth, the inheritance of a crown."

If St. Cyprian's testimony be of any weight, we have here the doctrine of infallibility clearly taught by him. He tells us, in the first passage, "that the Church will never fall from Christ."

[1] Cyprian, Epist. 69, ad Florentium Papinimum.

Therefore she will always maintain the doctrine which Christ has taught. And, in the second, "that the Spouse of Christ cannot become an adulteress, but that she is uncorrupt and pure." Therefore she cannot be corrupted with false doctrine; which is just what Roman Catholics now believe and teach.

St. Cyril of Alexandria (Dial. de Trin., lib. 4) writes thus: "He gave the name of Rock to nothing else but the unshaken and constant faith of the disciple: on which the Church of Christ is so settled and established as never to fall, but to bear up against the gates of hell, and so to remain for ever."

The first part of this passage is very much magnified by Protestant writers against St. Peter's supremacy. But this being foreign to my subject, I shall only throw a rub in their way, and so proceed. As St. Cyril says "that Christ gave the name of Rock to nothing else but the unshaken and constant faith of St. Peter"; so St. Jerome (Epist. 61, ad Pammachium) says as expressly "that it was not St. Peter's body, but his faith, that walked upon the waters" (tom. 2, page 254). Now both these fathers waived the literal meaning of the scriptural text, and delivered only the allegorical or causal sense of it, as being fittest for their purpose when they wrote. And in that sense their expressions were not improper, because St. Peter's faith was the only meritorious cause both of his walking upon the waters, and of Christ's promise that his Church should be built upon him. And, therefore, as it would be impertinent to conclude from St. Jerome's words that St. Peter's body, or person, did not walk upon the waters; so it does not very much recommend the good sense of Protestant writers to conclude from St. Cyril's words that he intended to exclude St. Peter's person from being the Rock upon which Christ promised to build his Church.

But I am less surprised at their not distinguishing between the allegorical and literal interpretations of Scriptures, than I am at their overlooking the plain meaning of the second part of St. Cyril's words, namely: "On which the Church of Christ is so settled and established as never to fall, but to bear up against the gates of

hell, and to remain for ever." In which the doctrine of infallibility is as strongly and clearly asserted as words can express it. I shall only add some passages from St. Augustine.

Aug. Enarr. in Psalm 57, Num. 6, tom. 4, page 545 ("They have gone astray from the womb, and spoken lies"—Psalm 57). "Were they, therefore, gone astray from the womb, because they have spoken lies? Or rather have they not spoken lies, because they were gone astray from the womb? For it is in the Church's womb that truth remains. Whosoever is separated from this womb of the Church must of necessity speak lies. I say he must necessarily speak lies who refuses to be conceived, or being conceived, has been thrown out by the mother."

Serm. de Symb. ad Catech., tom. 6, page 554: "After a confession of the Trinity, follows the Holy Church. Here is shown God and his temple—which is the Holy Church, the One Church, the True Church, the Catholic Church, which fights against all heresies. Fight she may, but she cannot be foiled. All heresies have gone out from her like useless branches lopped off from the vine, but she remains in her root, in her vine, in her charity. 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against her.'"

Enarr. 2, in Psalm 101, upon these words, "In the assembling the people together in one, and kings to serve our Lord, he answered him in the way of his strength," St. Augustine writes thus: "But that Church which was spread through all nations, now has no longer a being. It is quite lost. This is the cry of those who are not in the Church. O impudent clamor! She is not, because you do not belong to her! See that you have not for that reason lost your being. For she will have a being, though you have none. This abominable and accursed calumny, full of presumption and deceit, void of all truth, wisdom, and reason, idle, temerarious, rash, and pernicious, the Spirit of God foresaw when, even as it were against them, he proclaimed her unity, 'in assembling the people in one, and kings to serve our Lord'—because there were to arise some that would say against her, It is true, she was, but now she is perished. Show me, says she, the fewness of my days. I do not

inquire for my days in the next world. Those are without end. It is not those days of eternity I ask for. I desire to know my continuance in this world. These days I desire you to show me. And he has showed me, neither was the answer insignificant. And who was it but he that is the very way? And what was the information he gave me? 'Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.'"

And now I leave it to the judgment of any impartial reader, whether the fathers I have quoted were Protestants or Catholics in their principle relating to the matter under debate. They wrote against the heretics of their times, who all pretended the Church had failed. But they, on the contrary, not only maintained that she had not failed (nay, St. Augustine calls it an impudent clamor, an abominable and accursed calumny, to say she had failed), but also, that she cannot fail: that it is in the Church's womb that truth remains: that, being the Spouse of Christ, she cannot become an adulteress, but will always be pure and uncorrupt in her doctrine; that she will always remain in her root, and continue to do so to the end of the world: all which St. Augustine proves from these two texts: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it."[1] "And, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."[2] Whence it follows that all the passages I have quoted contain as full a condemnation of the present reformed churches as those of the heretics against whom they were written; and that not only the Word of God, but the whole current of antiquity is flatly against them: unless they will call unto their assistance old excommunicated heretics, and shelter themselves under the protection of the professed enemies of the Church of Christ. For let them look back as far as they please into primitive ages, it is among heretics alone they will find any friends. These were the men that pleaded for a fallible church; and their arguments, which the fathers answered, are now revived by Protestant writers, and turned against the Church of Rome, as we shall see hereafter.

[1] Matt. xvi. 18. [2] *Ibid.* xxviii. 20.

It was for this reason that Luther no sooner began his pretended reformation, but he declared open war against the fathers, whom he treated with as much arrogance and contempt as if they had been a parcel of blockheads, or mere school-boys. Good manners, indeed, ought to have made him forbear the latter, but the badness of his cause obliged him to the former. For he could not but be against antiquity, when antiquity was against him: and let the reformed churches put the fairest glosses they please upon their separation from the Church of Rome, the antiquity of her doctrine, maintained in the primitive ages by persons who certainly delivered the public faith of the Church in their times, is an argument of such weight against them as will ever carry the cause in the judgment of any thinking man in whom the love of the world has not stifled all sense of a future state.

The reason, therefore, why I have produced the testimony of these ancient fathers maintaining the Church's infallibility against the heretics of their times, is to convince the reader that the primitive Church understood the promises of Christ, which are the sole foundation of her infallibility, in the same sense as Roman Catholics now do. And that, by consequence, the sense we give them is not a precarious interpretation of private judgment, but has the whole authority of the Church of Christ to support it: since those eminent saints and doctors cannot be regarded otherwise than as authentic witnesses of what her public faith was in those primitive ages.

They who, in spite of the most solemn promises of Christ, are resolved that there shall be no such thing as an Infallible Church, have found out two ways to elude the force of them: first, by tacking a condition to all God's promises, which shall be fully answered hereafter; and, secondly, by distinguishing between fundamentals and non-fundamentals; whereby they pretend to baffle all the evidence Catholics produce to prove their point.

They say, then, that the promises of Christ, as also the words of St. Paul, regard only such articles of faith as are fundamental, that is, absolutely necessary to salvation, according to their system.

And so they allow the Church to be infallible in them, but not in other points which are not fundamental.

With this distinction, they think themselves safely intrenched; though it be in reality using the word of God as familiarly as a logical question, in which any precarious distinction is laid hold of that but serves to stave off an argument, and keep the defendant from being nonplussed. But surely some more respect is due to the sacred Word of God; and before a person undertakes to limit the sense of it, he ought to consider very seriously whether such a limitation be grounded in the Word of God itself; whether he offers no violence to the text, by wresting it from the sense intended by the Holy Ghost to one prompted by the prejudice of a party-cause; whether his interpretation be in any manner agreeable to the sense of the ancient Church. Finally, whether, by so limiting the Word of God, he will not draw on himself this curse pronounced by St. John, in his Revelation: "If any one shall add unto these things, God will add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of this book, God will take away his part out of the book of life."[1] If the enemies of infallibility had taken these precautions to heart, we should never have been acquainted with their distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals. For it is not only without any ground in the sacred text, but a mere forced interpretation upon it.

However, I presume it is to the first part of this distinction we are principally indebted for that charity which Protestants so much boast of, in allowing salvation to be attainable, and, by consequence, all means necessary to it to be found, in the Church of Rome. Antonius de Dominis, an apostate Archbishop of Spalatro, is said to have first imported this contraband merchandise into England, and it was greedily taken up, and is used by many Protestant writers. Dr. Potter tells us (page 63) that "the most necessary and fundamental truths, which constitute a church, are on both sides unquestioned." Dr. Stillingfleet assures us likewise

[1] Rev. xxii. 18.

in his "Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion" (page 54), that "the Church of England makes no articles of faith, but such as have the testimony and approbation of the whole Christian world of all ages, and are acknowledged to be such by Rome itself." And Mr. Thorndike, in his "Epilogue" (page 146), says: "I must, and do freely profess, that I find no position necessary to salvation prohibited, none destructive to salvation enjoined to be believed, by the Church of Rome."

This important concession (which will always rise up in judgment against reformed churches), extorted from our adversaries by the evidence of truth, was but a few years ago confirmed in the most solemn and authentic manner by the Protestant university of Helmstat (April 28, A.D. 1707) upon occasion of the match proposed between the Princess of Wolfembuttel and the Emperor Charles, who insisted upon this condition, that the princess, who was a Protestant, should conform to the Church of Rome. Whereupon the duke, her father, sent to the divines of Helmstat, to have their decision of the following case, namely: "Whether a Protestant princess, who is to be married to a Catholic prince, may with a safe conscience embrace the Roman Catholic religion?" And their decision, which is contained in a large printed sheet, begins thus:

"We answer that the question propounded cannot be solved solidly, without deciding first, whether, or no, the Catholics are in fundamental errors, or such as are inconsistent with salvation? Or, which amounts to the same, whether the constitution of the Romish Church be such as one may practise in it the true worship of God, and attain to salvation? Our answer to this second query, on which the first depends, is without hesitation in the affirmative, for these three reasons."

Then they proceed to expound their reasons, which are too long for me to insert. But the following words are remarkable: "Neither can it be deemed that the Romish Church is not a true Church, wherein the ministry of God's Word and the use of sacraments subsists. For if she were no more, or had never been, a true Church, all her members would be in a state of damnation, and

irrevocably lost; which none amongst us would dare to advance. Nay, Melanchthon himself has maintained that the Roman Church did not cease being the true Church," etc.; and toward the end I find this paragraph: " Having demonstrated that the foundation of religion subsists in the Roman Catholic Church, so that one may be orthodox, and live and die well, and obtain salvation in it, it is easy to decide the question propounded." They therefore gave their judgment, that the Princess of Wolfembuttel might safely change her religion, and become a member of the Church of Rome, to qualify herself for her marriage.

Here we have the judgment of a whole Protestant university given on a very solemn occasion. 1. That the true worship of God is practised in the Church of Rome. 2. That she never ceased to be a true Church, for which we quote Melanchthon's authority. 3. That her members may be orthodox, and live and die well, and obtain salvation. Nay, that none among them dare maintain that the members of the Church of Rome are in a state of damnation. And all this they infer from this avowed principle, namely: " Because that Church was never guilty of any fundamental error."

The first part, therefore, of the distinction, namely, " that the Church cannot err in fundamentals," is most certainly true. However, I cannot let it pass without drawing some consequences from it, before I offer my reasons against the second part, which denies her infallibility in points that are not fundamental.

The first consequence I draw from it is, that the Protestants of England are guilty of the blackest calumny and injustice in charging the Church of Rome with idolatry. For who can be so blind as not to see that the charge of idolatry is not only a flat contradiction to their owning that she never erred in fundamentals, but wholly inconsistent with their so much magnified charity in allowing salvation to be attainable in that Church? What! can a Church be orthodox—nay, infallible—in fundamentals, and yet fall into idolatry? Can the Divine Spirit be said to lead her into all fundamental truths, and at the same time permit her to teach " that divine worship is to be paid to creatures "? Or is salvation con-

sistent with the practice of it? These incoherences are so manifest, that if calumny be a deadly sin, and restitution of fame an indispensable duty, truly I cannot see how the authors or abettors of so black a calumny as is that of charging a whole Christian Church with idolatry, can have any pretence to salvation, without making that Church as effectual a reparation of honor as the divines of Helmstat have already done. Nay, the reparation ought to be as general and public as the slander has been. Dr. Stillingfleet's large treatise to prove Papists idolaters, and many other books and sermons upon the same subject, ought to be solemnly condemned; and the people made sensible that a Church free from fundamental errors cannot be an idolatrous Church; that the true worship of God, which is owned to be in the Church of Rome, is as opposite to idolatry as Christ is to Belial, or light to darkness. In a word, that since Protestants cannot deny but that the members of the Roman Catholic Church may be orthodox, and live and die well, and obtain salvation, it is inconsistent with all sense and reason to charge them with a crime which, being a violation of the very first commandment of the decalogue, must unavoidably make them forfeit their titles to the kingdom of God. This is the reparation they are bound in conscience to make to the Church of Rome. Nor can they refuse to do it, without resolving to continue not only in a deadly sin, but the grossest contradiction to themselves.

But what should make Protestants, who neither want wit nor learning, become guilty of so palpable a contradiction as suffices to startle any thinking man in whom all sense of natural justice, truth, and honor is not utterly extinguished? Truly, I can give no other reason for it than their being blindly persuaded of the lawfulness to blacken Papists by any methods whatsoever, whether foul or fair, just or unjust, right or wrong. Now both the parts of the contradiction I have proved upon them are most proper to answer this dishonest end. Idolatry is an abominable crime; therefore, Papists must be made guilty of it; for it will render them very odious. Yet salvation must not be denied them because this charitable opinion (the nonsense whereof will not be perceived by every-

body) will serve as a foil to set off the uncharitableness of Papists, who deny salvation to all that are not of their Church. I thank God, we have at least charity enough to return good for evil, and pray heartily for the salvation of those who hate and slander us in such an unchristian manner.

It follows, secondly, from the first part of the distinction, that both the first reformers were inexcusable for beginning, and that the churches established by them can give no satisfactory reasons for continuing, their separation from the Church of Rome. For how can they justify their separation from her, if she be orthodox in all fundamentals, that is, in all points necessary to salvation? The ground of this query is, because in matters of religion (the end whereof is the salvation of souls) nothing is of any solid weight or moment but what has a reference to this end. Which made our Saviour say that "there is but one thing necessary"; and without all dispute, salvation is this one thing. And therefore since, according to the Protestant distinction, all things necessary to salvation are to be found in the Roman Catholic Church, there can be nothing to give a just pretence to a breach of communion and separation from her. For is it any ways justifiable to raise or maintain a schism from a Church which has all means necessary to salvation infallibly secured to her? This cannot hold with any manner of reason, if we consider the nature of schism, how fatal its consequences are, and that even the sin of rebellion in a government is seldom attended with so great a train of evils as a schism in the Church. Now, the very greatest advocates for rebellion will scarce allow it to be justifiable in any other case than when the very constitution and fundamental laws of the kingdom are invaded. For then the sovereigns may be said to err in fundamentals. But all faults in governments of an inferior nature are insufficient even to give a colorable pretence to the sin of rebellion against a lawful sovereign.

Let us apply this to schism, which is a rebellion against the Church, and as heinous in its nature as that against the state, and, therefore, ought to have at least as just a pretence to color it: so

that, if it were possible for the Church to err in fundamentals, it is the only case in which a schism would be justifiable, because in any other case the remedy is worse than the disease. And if this be so in all schisms whatsoever, that which was caused by the leaders of the reformation, and threw all Europe into disorder and confusion, is much less capable of being justified upon any other grounds.

Whoever is the least versed in history cannot be ignorant of the deplorable calamities, both in Church and state, to which it gave birth: as subjects revolting from their sovereigns; the empire torn to pieces by the different factions of princes either opposing or espousing the cause of Martin Luther;[1] the kingdom of France engaged by the Huguenots in a bloody civil war for many years; sacred places profaned, religious houses pillaged and burned, the revenues of the Church seized by the secular power, thousands of families utterly ruined; and, in a word, all the scenes of horror and desolation which an obstinate and bloody war carried on by parties mutually incensed can produce, were the fruits of this fatal schism. Nay, has it not been, even of late years, the occasion of bloodshed in several parts of Europe? And is it possible that the dreadful profanations I have mentioned, and the spilling of so much Christian blood, should have no other pretence to justify it, than the interest of a few speculative questions, or points of religion, not at all fundamental, or in any manner necessary to salvation?

Truly, were I to have judged of the importance of the cause from its dismal effects, I should have concluded, without hesitation, that the very essentials of religion were at stake in those unhappy times; that the Church was threatened with nothing less than a total subversion; in a word, that Christianity was upon the point of being abolished, and the Alcoran just going to take the place of the Bible. For then I should not have been surprised to see all Europe in a flame, and prodigal of its best blood, for the defence of so great and good a cause. But, God be praised! the

[1] For an outline of the bloody consequences of his pernicious example and false teaching, see the foot-note, Volume I, page 104.

Protestant distinction has prevented all such mistakes. Christianity never was in danger, the Bible is yet safe in Catholic hands, and all the fundamentals of religion stand firm. The very enemies of the Roman Catholic Church declare she has never erred in fundamentals, that is, in any point necessary to salvation. And what can they desire more? What reasonable grounds can there be for a schism? Why are the members of that Church persecuted? why are they deprived of their birthright, and the privileges of all other subjects? why are Jews, Quakers, and Anabaptists preferred before them?—since they teach nothing that is contrary to salvation. For is not eternal salvation, and all means necessary to it, sufficient to answer all the ends and purposes of religion?

But can any of the reformed churches promise themselves as much? There are some weighty reasons for the negative. First, they are all fallible; and may, therefore, be mistaken in their belief that they want nothing necessary to salvation. Secondly, they have the whole body of Roman Catholics, all the world over, against them; and their judgment is not without weight. Thirdly, their very owning that salvation is attainable in the Roman Catholic Church is a strong proof of their being excluded from it. For, since St. Paul has positively declared these two things, namely, that there is but " one faith," because God cannot reveal contradictories, and that " without faith it is impossible to please God," I cannot see how they, who own salvation possible in the Church of Rome—which, therefore, has the faith required by St. Paul—can flatter themselves with the hopes of it in any other communion; since all other churches, by continuing in their schism, break that unity of faith which St. Paul requires as necessary to please God, and, by consequence, to salvation.

I am sensible I shall here be taxed with uncharitableness, in denying salvation to all churches but my own. To which I answer, first, that if I believe myself to be in the true Church of Christ, I cannot do otherwise without contradicting the faith of that Church, which teaches that there is no salvation for those who keep wilfully and obstinately out of it. I answer, secondly, that I can never think

it an uncharitable office to admonish persons of the danger in which I conceive they are, though I should really be mistaken in my judgment of the matter. But I own sincerely that I cannot make it a point of honor to pretend to be more charitable than the holy fathers were in the primitive ages; who agreed unanimously in declaring all those to be in the state of damnation who separated themselves from their Church; and I dare say, with the greatest assurance, they were all in communion with the see of Rome. I shall choose a few passages out of many.

(N. B. That most of the fathers I shall quote wrote against heretics who denied none of those articles which Protestants call fundamental.)

St. Irenæus (Lib. 4, adv. Hær., c. 62) writes thus: "God will judge those who make schisms; who are abominable, void of the love of God; and having more concern for their own convenience than for the unity of the Church; who, for inconsiderable reasons, divide and break asunder the great and glorious body of Christ, and endeavor, as much as in them lies, to ruin it utterly; having peace in their mouths, but working nothing but destruction; truly straining at a gnat, and swallowing a camel. For, whatever evils they design to redress, it will be much less than the evil of schism."

St. Cyprian (De Unit. Eccl.): "Whosoever, leaving the Church, cleaves to an adulteress, is cut off from the promises of the Church. He that falls from the Church of Christ, shall never come to the rewards of Christ. He is an alien, he is a profane person, he is an enemy. He cannot have God for his father, who has not the Church for his mother. If it were possible for any to escape that was not in the ark of Noah, it shall likewise be possible for him to escape who is not in the Church."

Idem, infra: "What peace can the enemies of their brethren promise themselves? What kind of sacrifices do they imagine they offer up, who are in contention with the priests? Can they think that Christ is with them in their meetings, being assembled out of the unity of the Church? Such as these, though they suffer death in the confession of his name, yet is not their blood capable of wash-

ing out their stain. The unpardonable and horrid crime of schism is not to be expiated by suffering. He can be no martyr who is not in the Church. They are enemies to God, who will not keep peace in the Church. Though they deliver their bodies to be burnt, or are torn to pieces by wild beasts, yet this will never be a crown of their faith, but a punishment of their treachery: nor a glorious issue of a Christian courage, but a desperate end. Such a one may be put to death, but he can never be crowned."

St. John Chrysostom (Hom. 11, in cap. 4, Epist. ad Ephesios): "This is spoken not only to those who rule, but also to subjects who are under their government. A certain holy man spoke a thing which was very bold, and yet he spoke it. And what was it? He affirmed that this sin [of schism] 'cannot be washed away, even with the blood of martyrdom.' For tell me, for what reason do you suffer martyrdom? Is it not for the glory of Christ? And how can you, who desire to lay down your lives for Christ, in the meantime overthrow the Church for which Christ shed his blood?"

St. Augustine (Lib. de Unit. Eccl., c. 19): "None can arrive to salvation, or life everlasting, but he that has Christ for his head. And it is impossible that any should have Christ for his head, unless he be a member of his body, the Church."

Idem (Epist. 204, ad Donat.): "Being out of the pale of the Church, separated from its unity and bond of charity, thou wouldst not escape damnation, though thou shouldst be burnt alive for confessing the name of Christ."

(N. B. That St. Augustine was no uncharitable man.)

Idem (Lib. 2, contra Epist. Parm., c. 11): "We produce these instructions from Holy Writ, that it may evidently appear that there is no wickedness can compare with the sacrilege of schism, because there is no just necessity for separation."

St. Fulgentius (ad Petrum Diaconum, c. 39): "Believe steadfastly, and doubt not at all, but that every man, who is a heretic, or schismatic, baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, if he be not in the unity of the Catholic Church, though he gives ever so much alms, and lose his life for the

name of Christ, yet he cannot be saved. For neither baptism, nor liberal alms, nor death itself for the profession of Christ, can avail a man anything in order to salvation, if he does not hold the unity of the Catholic Church."

This was the language of the ancient fathers, which fully justifies the doctrine of the Church of Rome in excluding from salvation all such as are guilty of heresy or schism. For it is a plain case that it was their judgment that though a man be a Christian by baptism and the belief of Christ, nay, though he suffers death for professing Christ, yet he cannot escape eternal damnation if he be separated from the unity of the Catholic Church.

What an authentic condemnation is this of Luther and Calvin, and other leaders of the pretended reformation! And, indeed, of all the reformed churches; which, though they are Christian churches, by their due administration of baptism, and their belief of the incarnation, death, resurrection, and divinity of Jesus Christ, yet (if the judgment of the ancient Church be of any weight) are incapable of salvation, in being separated from their Mother Church, from which they all went forth, just as those heretics and schismatics did against whom the fathers quoted by me have pronounced sentence of eternal damnation. To which those eminent saints were not prompted by heat, or passion, or uncharitableness (whereof the Church of Rome is now accused for adhering to their doctrine), but merely by the force of truth, and an ardent zeal for retrieving those prodigals who had quitted their Father's house, and saving from perdition the sheep that were gone astray.

If any one objects that the Church of Rome is alone accountable for the separation, as being the cause of it by excommunicating the reformed churches; if any one, I say, objects this by way of jest (for I presume no man of sense can do it seriously), I answer him, however, first, that the Arians, and all other heretics that ever were in the world, have the same plea. The Arminians have it against the Church of Holland; and the Socinians against the Church of England. For the fourth canon of the national synod under King Charles I, A.D. 1640, orders that any one who is accused

of Socinianism, unless he will absolutely and in terms abjure it, be excommunicated.

I answer, secondly, that the sentence of excommunication pronounced by the Church of Rome presupposed the schism, and was the punishment, but not the cause of it: as a bill of attainder against rebellious subjects (which is a kind of lay excommunication) is not the cause of rebellion, but a just punishment of it.

Lastly, I answer him in the words of an ingenious Protestant who, in his apology for the non-juring clergy, in answer to Dr. Sharpe, late Archbishop of York, by whom they were accused of schism, writes thus: "You," says he, "have separated from them, and not they from you. For they are just where they were when you left them, and have not budged a foot from their Church. You cannot say they have broken from you, unless you will affirm that when a ship breaks from the shore, where she lay at anchor, the shore removes from her, and not she from the shore."

This represents exactly the case between the Church of Rome and the reformed churches; and particularly between the Roman Catholics (though now a minority in their number) and the Protestants in Great Britain. The Roman Catholics are just where the Protestants left them, and have not budged a foot from their Church. Their faith and religion is the very same as it was, not only when the reformation began, but for nine hundred years before it was ever thought of; that is, ever since England's conversion. And Protestants can no more say that Roman Catholics have broken from them, than they will affirm, "that when a ship breaks from the shore, where she lay at anchor, the shore removes from her, and not she from the shore." And who, then, are authors of the schism? Who are accountable to God for the damnation of so many souls? But this is too much in answer to so weak an objection. I shall now proceed to examine the second part of the distinction.

The second part of the distinction denies the Church to be infallible in points that are not fundamental. This I shall prove

to be a contradiction to the Word of God. First, it is inconsistent with our Saviour's promise that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Because the gates of hell would prevail effectually against the Church if she should ever fall into any heresy, let that heresy be what it will.

It is true, some heresies strike more directly at the root of Christianity than others, and those may be called fundamental heresies. But every heresy, whether it be fundamental or not, destroys all divine faith; so that if the Church should teach any one point of doctrine contrary to the revealed word of God (which I call heresy), she would lose all faith; she would be no longer the Church of Christ, but the school of Satan, and the gates of hell would prevail against her. For the devil is certainly the "father of lies," and much more of heresy, which is the worst of lies because it gives the lie to the revealed Word of God. And would not, then, the devil prevail against the Church, if he made her become the mother of lies, and even of such lies as are a contradiction to God's own word? I think the matter will bear no manner of dispute.

Nor is it anything to the purpose, whether the lie be in a matter, or relating to an object, that is fundamental, or not. Because, whatever its immediate object be, the whole theological virtue of faith is as much destroyed by it, as the whole theological virtue of charity is destroyed by any one mortal sin.

To pursue this comparison, which will help to set the matter in a clear and easy light, we may say that faith is to the Church what charity is to the soul: and heresy is just as opposite to faith, as mortal sin is to charity. Now, though blasphemy, for example, be a more grievous sin than calumny, yet charity is lost, and the soul receives a mortal wound by the one as well as the other. In like manner, therefore, though a fundamental heresy, as the denying the divinity of Christ, be more impious, with reference to its immediate object, than one that is not fundamental; yet the one, as well as the other, gives a mortal wound to faith; and, by consequence, if the Church should teach any such heresy, she would be without faith, and the gates of hell would prevail against her; though the

immediate object of that heresy were not relating to any matter of importance, or in itself necessary to salvation.

The principle whereon this doctrine is founded is because divine faith is grounded upon revelation, and not upon the importance of its immediate object, or as the belief of that truth is of itself a means necessary to salvation. As, for instance, it is not a fundamental point whether Balaam's ass spoke, or not; or whether Samson killed a thousand Philistines with the jawbone of an ass, or with the jawbone of a horse. Mankind, without all dispute, might have been saved, though these two scriptural events had never happened. Yet if I should presume to deny or dispute either of them, I should be a rank heretic for my pains. Because, by so doing, I should call in question the whole authority of the Bible; which, if it can lie in any one point, may do so in all the rest, and so the whole law and prophets would be rendered precarious. Nay, I should lose all divine faith, though I believed everything else: because faith is not barely a belief of things revealed, but the principal motive of our belief of them must be precisely because they are revealed. And, therefore, if I deny or question any one revealed point, though ever so inconsiderable in itself, I believe nothing upon the motive of divine revelation; and, by consequence, my whole faith is destroyed.

Whence it plainly follows that if the Church should err in any one, single point of faith, whether it be fundamental as to its object or not, she would lose all divine faith, and a Church without divine faith is no longer the Church of Christ. She is no longer that Virgin Church, without spot or blemish, which Christ espoused to himself forever; but becomes an adulteress, and is delivered up to the power of Satan; which is a contradiction to what our Saviour has positively promised.

Secondly, it is no less a contradiction to his promise that "the Holy Ghost shall teach his Church all things"; because this promise is not only without limitation, but is a full answer to any distinction that puts a limitation upon it. For the word "all" is comprehensive and universal, including every revealed truth that comes within

the determination of the Church; and to restrain it is to offer violence to the sense it naturally imports.

Thirdly, it is a contradiction to St. Paul saying that the Church "is the pillar and ground of truth"; because a Church guilty of errors opposite to any revealed truths whatever, whether fundamental or non-fundamental, cannot be called "the pillar and ground of truth" without violently wresting words from their obvious and natural signification.

Fourthly, neither can it easily be reconciled with these words of St. Paul to the Ephesians (iv. 11, 14): "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, . . . that we be no more like children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine." For who sees not that this end designed by Christ is in a manner frustrated by limiting the Church's infallibility to fundamentals only? Because, the number of these being wholly precarious (as I shall show hereafter), if there be no infallible Church to fix our belief in reference to all revealed truths whatsoever, we shall still be children in faith, and "every wind of doctrine" will suffice to toss us from one belief to another.

This appears plainly in the numberless divisions and diversity of opinions in the reformed churches; not any two of them agreeing in the same system of religion. And it is morally impossible men should agree when every one is encouraged by the practice of the very founders of his Church to make his own private judgment the rule and standard of his faith, and no unerring judge is allowed of to appeal to in doubtful cases.

It is true, any Church may, by the severity of laws and censures, oblige men to a respectful silence; but this will never deliver them from doubts and uncertainties, nor fix their faith upon a solid basis. Their tongues and pens may acquiesce, but their judgment will still revolt. Their private reasons will stand good, and keep their full force. Nay, what seems reason to-day, will, perhaps, seem otherwise to-morrow; and thus will they always be wavering, "like children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doc-

trine"; whereas, if an Infallible Judge be acknowledged, whenever that Judge pronounces sentence, all doubts immediately vanish. The judgment is immovably fixed, and every private understanding "captivated unto the obedience of faith."

And this is the true reason of that perfect harmony in all matters of faith among the members of the Roman Catholic Church. For though they be allowed to dispute *pro* and *con* about questions not determined by the Church (which some will needs miscall divisions among them), yet when the Church declares herself positively upon any point, there is no appeal from her to any private judgment; but every one is bound by the principles of his religion to submit to her decisions. So that all the members of this Church, even in the most distant parts of the world—nay, though differing in everything else, as interest, humors, customs, discipline, and language—yet agree perfectly in all points of faith. Because they have but one unerring Guide to follow, which is the Church, directed, according to Christ's promise, by the Spirit of Truth.

The antiquity and authority of the Nicene Creed is owned by all: and it being, next after the Apostles' Creed, the shortest summary of Christian religion, I question not but Protestants will easily grant that all its articles are fundamental. I should, therefore, be glad to know what they think, or mean, when they pronounce this article, "I believe One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." I presume the true meaning of it is that Christ has a Church on earth which is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic.

This, then, is an article of the Christian faith; and since articles of faith are unchangeable, it has always been, and will always continue to be one. For if it should ever cease to be true that Christ has such a Church on earth, whoever should then pronounce that article of the Nicene Creed, instead of professing an article of faith, would make profession of a downright falsehood: which being absurd in itself, it is manifest that the Church described in the Nicene Creed can never cease to have a being upon earth.

Whence I argue thus. The Church described in the Nicene

Creed will have a being as long as the world lasts. But if she should at any time become guilty of any errors whatsoever against the revealed Word of God, she would then cease to have a being; therefore, the Church described in the Nicene Creed, which is undoubtedly the Church of Christ, can never become guilty of any such errors.

That she would then cease to have a being, I prove thus. Because she would then neither be One nor Holy nor Catholic nor Apostolic.

First, she would not be One, because there can be no unity of faith where there is no faith at all. Now the Church loses her whole faith by any one error against the revealed Word of God; as I have already showed. Therefore, if she should ever become guilty of any such error, her unity of faith must, of consequence, be destroyed by it.

I prove, again, that heresy and unity of faith are inconsistent, because heresy is the natural product of private judgment, and private judgment is a constant source and principle of division. The reason whereof is manifest; because men differ not only from one another in their private judgment—nay, it is morally impossible it should be otherwise—but are frequently inconsistent even with themselves: so that as often as they see things in a different light, they are apt to change their belief accordingly. Hence it is that no heresy ever came into the world but various sects spawned from it soon after; and a dunghill is not more fruitful in breeding vermin, than private judgment, and Scripture corrupted by it, are in producing sects. It is, therefore, morally impossible that a church corrupted with any heresy should be one.

Secondly, she would also cease to be Holy, because this title cannot belong to a church adulterated in her doctrine and void of faith.

Thirdly, she would not be Catholic, because she would want universality of time. For, since truth is more ancient than error, the former would have had a priority of time before the latter. In a word, she is called Catholic because her faith is Catholic; and

no errors can be the objects of Catholic faith, nor have I ever heard of Catholic heresies in my whole life.

Lastly, she would not be Apostolic, any more than the schismatical churches of the Donatists, Novatians, and other heretics, who never erred in fundamentals. But why may not their churches be called Apostolic? Because the apostles never taught errors of any kind whatever, whether fundamental or non-fundamental. And, therefore, if the doctrine of the Church of Christ were at any time of this linsey-woolsey texture, made up of fundamental truths and non-fundamental lies, it would cease to be a doctrine derived from the apostles; and a church cannot be called Apostolic unless she has the whole body of her doctrine from them.

Hence it plainly follows that the second part of the distinction utterly overthrows the fore-mentioned article of the Nicene Creed. And if one article can ever prove false, we may give up the rest for company's sake, and the Apostles' Creed into the bargain.

Again, I argue thus. The Church of Christ on earth has either always been One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, or not. If not, then those who said the Nicene Creed while there was no such Church, professed that they believed a thing which was false. But if Christ always had such a Church, then I must be so free as to tell the reformed gentlemen, that a Church which we believe and profess to be One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic in her doctrine, is proof against any Protestant distinction; and to reform the faith of such a Church is the same bold attempt, and as unwarrantable, as to reform the Creed itself.

I shall conclude this section with observing how unlucky our adversaries are in their favorite distinction, since in the first part of it they contradict themselves, and in the second they give the lie to the Word of God and the Nicene Creed. But something was to be said to throw dust before the eyes of ignorant people. The promises of Christ were positive, and clear against them. If they denied all, the matter would have an ill appearance. If they granted all, the reformation was utterly overthrown. The best way, therefore, in so difficult a case, was to split and divide. A dis-

tinction in disputes makes a handsome figure, and a show at least of saying something, though nothing to the purpose. But their well-affected brethren would not perceive this. And, therefore, it was better to do so, than be silent, and give up all, when all was at stake. But I have still something more to say to the second part of the distinction.

If the Church can err in points that are not fundamental, we can have no certainty of the truth of any articles, but such as have their evidence from human reason; and so we shall all be in a fair way of turning deists; because every man will be furnished with a plausible pretence to question the decisions of the Church in any point that has ever been disputed. For he needs but maintain stiffly that the matter in question is not fundamental, and this will be a sufficient warrant to believe or disbelieve it, according as his own private reason shall direct him.

Thus, an Arian will say that the consubstantiality of the Son is no fundamental point, and that the Church has erred in it. A Socinian will say the same of his divinity, and a Nestorian of the unity of his person; and an Anti-trinitarian is so far from yielding that the belief of the adorable Trinity is necessary to salvation, that he regards it as a mere chimera. Nay, deists maintain that the belief of a God is the only fundamental point of religion.

How, then, shall we know what points are fundamental, and what not? Can Protestants fix any sure mark, or rule, to know a fundamental by, and distinguish it from such as are not fundamental? Have the reformed churches ever agreed about their number of fundamentals? But how is it possible they should? Since, when they argue against Papists, they all disown an Infallible Judge to determine the matter, and a fallible one may be mistaken in his calculation, and either obtrude that for a fundamental which is not so, or reject one that really is so: and so he may either overshoot his mark, or fall short of it. Besides, there never will be wanting some of those who will copy after the pattern set before them by the two great patriarchs of the reformation, and appeal from any judge to their own darling private reason.

If they say that all fundamentals are contained in the three creeds, I answer, first, that then this article, "I believe One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," is, by consequence, a fundamental; which is like to do Protestants but little service, as I have already showed. I answer, secondly, that there is no mention in the creeds either of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or of episcopacy being of divine institution, or of the revelation of Scriptures. All which may, therefore, be mere impositions, for aught we know. But whether they be in the number of fundamentals, or not, I am sure they are articles of great importance.

If they answer that these and all fundamentals are clearly expressed in Scripture, I answer, first, that the Scriptures are no less clear in numberless points which are not fundamental: and by what rule, then, shall we discern the one from the other? For the Scriptures do not tell us whether they are fundamental truths, or not. I answer, secondly, that the Arians, reading Scripture with Arian spectacles, found their own doctrine clearly expressed in Christ's own words. Because the Scriptures, when interpreted by private judgment, are usually made a mere nose of wax, which may be turned and set what way any man pleases. The rankest heretic that ever was upon the face of the earth, never wanted clear Scripture, as he pretended, to support his cause. Nay, the devil himself, when he tempted Christ, had Scripture ready to color his wicked suggestion. But it was Scripture interpreted by the spirit of lies: as it always is when private judgment sets up for an interpreter of it against the sense and authority of the Church.

I presume no man will say that the Thirty-nine Articles, though they may properly be called the Church of England's creed, contain nothing but fundamentals. For, besides that many of them are mere negatives, or contradictories to the pretended Popish errors, which, according to the distinction, are no fundamental points: there are some others which only regard discipline; and the discipline of all churches, being changeable (according to the thirty-fourth article), can never come up to the nature of a fundamental. And, by consequence, the Thirty-nine Articles determine

not their number, but leave us in an entire uncertainty of it. Now, if we have no certain rule to know fundamentals by, it follows that there is scarce any point of faith the truth whereof may not be questioned, because we may doubt whether it be fundamental. And if it be not, the Church may err in it, according to the second part of the distinction, which renders all faith and religion precarious.

Hence it is, that, rejecting first, and then limiting, the Church's authority in deciding controversies of religion, has opened the way to the most impious and blasphemous heresies. And there is scarce anything so sacred in religion, but has been, and is to this day, questioned by some of those who have been brought up in the principles of the reformation. For when the Church is made cheap, and her authority precarious, what wonder is it that (the very best and strongest fence of religion being broken down) men should run loose into the most extravagant opinions? For what principle can a man have after that, to fix his belief of any mystery, but his own private reason? And since the very sublimest mysteries of the Christian religion appear the most repugnant to human reason, when a person has once imbibed this principle, and settles it as a rule and maxim to govern his faith by, namely: that there is no Church on earth, not even the Church established by Christ, but may deceive him, he will never stand to examine whether the points in question be fundamental, or not, but whether they be consonant to reason and good sense; and if they appear otherwise, he will conclude that the Church may err in them as well as any other. Nay, more probably in them, because he cannot persuade himself that God should ever reveal that for a divine truth, which, perhaps, in his notion is rank nonsense: as that the eternal and immortal God should become a mortal man, which is a scandal to Jews, and a folly to Gentiles; or that three divine persons, really distinct, should be but one God: which seems as impossible to him, as that Peter, Paul, and John should be but one man; or that two and one should not make three.

Hence it is that the nation swarms with Socinians, Anti-trini-

tarians, and those who style themselves Free-thinkers, which is now become a modish sect. And what wonder is it? For the sect of Free-thinkers, though of a later date, as to its name, than the other sects that have spawned from the reformation, is but the natural fruit of it. Nay, no man can pretend to set up for a reformer of religion, unless he be first an adept in the liberal science of free-thinking; that is, unless he sets up his own private judgment against the Church which he intends to reform.

It was thus the first great reformation of Arius began. In the same manner, Nestorius, Eutyches, Pelagius, Donatus, Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius,[1] and the whole college of reforming apostles, commenced free-thinkers, by refusing to submit their private judgment to their Mother Church, in order to become reformers of it. In a word, the only difference between the modern free-thinkers, as they make a separate sect, and the other fore-mentioned reformers, is, that free-thinkers are for a thorough reformation all at once, without giving quarter even to fundamentals; and so reform by wholesale what others have only reformed by retail. So that I really see not how a member of any of the reformed churches can fairly undertake to confute a free-thinker upon reformation principles, or without exposing his own weak side.

Suppose a member of the Church of England should tell a free-thinker that he is bound to submit his private judgment to that church. He would certainly answer him that, by the same rule, Luther and Calvin ought to have submitted to the Church of Rome; and then the great work of the reformation would never have been heartily carried on.

If he should tell him, again, that there is a great difference between the "virgin" Church of England and the "corrupt" Church of Rome, the free-thinker would be apt to put this puzzling question to him, namely, Whether, in the beginning of the reformation, there was anything to make good this charge against the Church of Rome, but the private judgment of the free-thinking Martin Luther? For Luther for a long time stood alone, as

[1] Zwingli, the German form of the Latin Zuinglius, is used elsewhere in this work.

Bishop Tillotson assures us, and as we shall see more at large hereafter.

Lastly, if the Protestant should tell him that a man by himself is more likely to err, and go astray, than a whole Church, because thousands can see more than one; and that therefore he ought in reason to submit to the church established by law: the free-thinker would readily answer him, that this is establishing a very dangerous Popish principle, and building the authority of a particular reformed church upon the ruins of the whole reformation. For, according to this principle, Luther, Calvin, and the other reformers were wholly in the wrong in trusting to their own private judgment, preferably to that of the whole Church then in being.

If the Protestant replies that their private judgment was grounded on the Word of God, the free-thinker will readily answer that he desires no more: provided he be but allowed to be himself (as Luther and Calvin were) the interpreter of God's Word. For, in reality, whoever appeals from the Church to the written Word of God, appeals effectually to his own private judgment, because he makes that the sole interpreter of it.

He will also answer him, that numbers in religion, unless there be something else to support it, is no conclusive argument for the truth. For if it were, he ought to turn Papist rather than Protestant. Since, if the matter were to be decided by polling, the Papists would carry it against all the Protestants in Europe, much more against the Church of England taken singly.

Thus will the free-thinker stand his ground against any reformed Church, and, upon reformation principles, maintain the doctrine of free-thinking. But surely none of the reformed churches can have the confidence to write seriously against free-thinking, or be hearty enemies to it; since they all owe to it their very birth and being.

Was not free-thinking the very mother and nurse of the reformation? For if Luther, and Calvin, and others, who reformed their reformation, had not been stanch free-thinkers, they

would certainly have submitted to the Church whereof they were all members for many years; and then reforming would never have come into fashion. But they thought their Mother Church was grown old and blind; and, therefore, would not trust her any further than they could see with their own eyes. So they all set themselves to think freely. One thought one way, another thought another way. For they all differed in their way of thinking; and each one thought himself as able a free-thinker, and as capable of modelling a church, as any of the rest; which at length produced the different reformed churches of Lutherans, Calvinists, Independents, Brownists, Arminians, Anabaptists, Quakers, and the like. And is it, then, a wonder that churches which have received their beginning from, and owe their whole creation and existence to, free-thinking, should at all times produce some members who, being men of wit and learning, should claim the first privilege to themselves, and think as freely as their forefathers? The thing cannot naturally be otherwise. For since the founders of their churches have set them the example, why should not they follow it? Why should not Toland, Clark, and Whiston, and the author of the discourse of free-thinking, turn reformers, as well as Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, etc. Papists alone can claim no right to free-thinking in matters of religion, because, believing their Church to be infallible in her decisions, according to the promises of Christ, they are bound to submit to her without limitation or reserve in everything she teaches. Which, indeed, is the only thing upon earth that can maintain unity of faith, take away all uncertainty in matters of religion, and keep men from "being like children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine."

This is a natural consequence from what has been said already; but I shall further prove it from the twentieth Protestant article of religion, where we find the following clause: "The Church has authority in controversies of faith, and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written. Neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to the other."

It seems, then, "that the Church has authority in controversies of faith." But what sort of authority do the compilers of the articles allow her? Are her children bound to submit to it, or not? If not, then her authority stands for a mere cipher. But if they are, then the compilers, and all their Protestant predecessors and brethren, were inexcusable in not submitting to the Church of Rome.

Again, has she authority in all controversies, or only in some? If in all, then the distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals must be dropped: unless the compilers can make it appear that the Church of England has a special charter from Christ to require submission even to articles that are not fundamental; which, however, they pretend the Church of Rome never had. But if she has authority only in some controversies—such, I presume, as regard fundamentals—then her authority is as precarious as the number of her fundamentals, and every article may be disputed with her.

But the latter part of the article explains, or rather kicks down, the whole extent of her authority. "The Church has authority, . . . and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written. Neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to the other."

Here, then, it is supposed that the church is capable, first, of ordaining things contrary to the Word of God; secondly, of expounding one place of Scripture so as to make it be repugnant, or a contradiction, to another. For, whoever puts in a caveat against anything, supposes the thing to be possible. Otherwise, it would be like making a law to forbid men to fly, or walk upon their heads. But who is here to be the judge to determine when the Church commits any such blunder? I presume she will not give verdict against herself. Every private man, then, may erect himself into a judge of the doctrine of his Mother Church; for he is here furnished with fair pretences for it. And it is in effect what Luther and Calvin did, when they pretended to reform the Church of Rome.

What a large and noble field is here again laid open for the free-thinker to exert himself in, and triumph over the Church! What! Is she, then, capable even of such gross absurdities as, by a contradictory interpretation of Scripture, to make "one part of it be repugnant to another"! If this be true, what must become of faith and religion? Must not free-thinking break in upon us like an irresistible torrent, when the Church, whose wisdom and authority in interpreting Scriptures should be the main bulwark against it, is supposed even by her own teachers not to be wholly incapable of imposing contradictions on her children instead of revealed truths? If a private man be convicted of contradicting himself, he becomes contemptible by it. And what idea must we, then, have of a Church whose judgment is represented to us as capable of a weakness that would sink the reputation even of a private person? Surely, Christ never meant to establish such a Church as this, when he made her the solemn promise that "he would be with her all days, even to the consummation of the world," and designed her to be our Guide to heaven, and lead men to salvation.

But the compilers of the article considered, wisely, that they were then settling the authority of a church which was yet in her leading-strings. For she had broken loose from her Mother Church but a few years before; and to justify that separation, it was necessary to give a broad hint that her Mother had prevaricated by "ordaining things contrary to the word of God," and "expounding it so as to make it repugnant to itself." For when a daughter runs away from her own mother, they who espouse the daughter's cause cannot do less than give some plausible reasons for such extraordinary conduct, which is irregular in itself; and at the same time precaution her against the failings which they lay to the mother's charge. This obliged the compilers to cramp the authority of their infant church at the very time when they could not avoid making a decent mention of it.

In effect, it is impossible for the advocates of any reformed church to plead for church authority, without speaking incoherently, and boxing themselves. For if they allow a coactive power

over men's consciences—that is, a power to oblige them both to an outward conformity and an inward submission to all her decrees—it flies immediately in their face that they are then guilty both of heresy and schism, in not having paid that conformity and submission to the Church of Rome. But if they allow her no such power (as the second part of the distinction is effectually inconsistent with it), her authority becomes precarious, of course, and she holds it only by the courtesy of her own children, who may dispute it with her when the fancy takes them; just as Luther and Calvin and the other reformers disputed it with their Mother Church.

The truth of the whole matter is this. The compilers of the Thirty-nine Articles had a hard task to perform. Something was to be said, of course, concerning the Church's authority. But it was dangerous to say too much, for fear of running insensibly into the Popish error of infallibility, which would have ruined the whole pretence of the reformation. They were, therefore, under an unhappy necessity of building with one hand, and pulling down with the other. And so they first granted "that the Church has authority in controversies of faith." For to set up a church, without giving her any authority at all, would not have looked decent. This, therefore, had a handsome appearance. But lest this concession should render the first reformers wholly inexcusable, in not having submitted to that authority in their Mother Church, they took care that the very next lines tacked to it should give it a mortal stab, by insinuating that the Church is not incapable of the grossest errors both in doctrine and practice—in practice, by ordaining things contrary to the Word of God; and in doctrine, by expounding one place in Scripture so that it be repugnant to the other. Which, though it was chiefly designed for an innuendo that the Church of Rome had been guilty of both; yet every one may, without much logic, conclude from it that the Church of England, which is directly spoken of in the article, is no less fallible than her Mother Church was supposed to be; and, by consequence, if her own children should judge her guilty of errors, they have the same title to reform her as she had to reform the Church of Rome. For

what was warrantable in her, cannot be unwarrantable in them; according to the old proverb, "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." Nay, the thing has already happened; for the Presbyterians, Quakers, and Independents, who pretend to have several articles of impeachment against her, have effectually separated themselves from her communion on that score; and let any man then judge, whether this does not render all Church authority precarious.

But God forbid the Church of Christ should be suspected capable of such an absurdity as to make the Word of God contradict itself. Nay, whatever church is capable of it, is manifestly convicted not to be of divine extraction, but of a spurious breed. She has too much of an earthly complexion to be the beautiful Spouse of Christ; neither has she the Spirit of Truth, but the father of lies for her guide. The Church of Christ is the "pillar and ground of truth," according to St. Paul. She is without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, according to the same apostle. Christ "has espoused her to himself for ever." [1] And the Spouse of Christ cannot be an adulteress, but is incorrupt and pure, according to St. Cyprian.

This made St. Augustine depend so entirely upon her authority, that he declared "he would not believe the Gospels themselves, unless the authority of the Church induced him to it." [2] And since he received the Scriptures themselves barely upon her authority, it cannot be doubted but he believed she might likewise be safely trusted with the interpretation of their true sense and meaning. So that this learned and ancient father was not for precautioning his readers with suppositions that she could "ordain anything contrary to the word of God, or make Scriptures contradict themselves." Nay, in the heat of his zeal for the Church of God, he would have called it "an abominable and accursed calumny, full of presumption and deceit; void of all truth, wisdom, and reason; idle, rash, and pernicious." [3] And therefore, to confound all such injurious suppositions, and show the entire confidence he had in his Guide, he

[1] Hos. ii. [2] Contra Epist. Fund., c. 4. [3] Enarr. 2, in Psalm 101.

made the fore-mentioned declaration; which, though it raises the Church's authority to its highest pitch, it only places it upon its true and proper basis.

I have now proved the infallibility of the Church which Christ has established on earth, from the concurring testimonies of Scriptures and fathers: which is all that can be required for proof of any article of religion. For how can we learn revealed truths, but from the revealed Word of God, interpreted by that authority which Christ himself has established and appointed for that end? And, therefore, those who, in their defence of the Church's infallibility, lay a stress upon certain rational congruities, as that it is inconsistent with the infinite goodness of God to leave men without an infallible guide, appear to me to take the question by the wrong handle. For the dispute between Catholics and Protestants is not whether God in his infinite goodness be bound to give us such a guide, but whether, in effect, he has been so merciful as to do it? Now the revealed Word of God tells us positively he has. The promises of Christ are as clear as words can make them; and the faith of the ancient Church, grounded on those promises, is conveyed to us in the writings of the holy fathers. Upon this foundation the Church's infallibility is built—a foundation so strong and firm, that if God's Word may be relied on, it wants no arguments from congruities of human reason to support it.

Now, then, let us see where the Infallible Church is to be found. The point I have undertaken to prove is, that the Church in communion with the see of Rome, has alone an unquestionable title to it. And I shall either give her this name, or call her the Roman Catholic Church, or the Church of Rome: she being so called because the Bishop of Rome is her visible head, or Supreme Pastor. But whatever name I give her, I desire the reader to take notice that I mean not the particular diocese of Rome; for this is no more the Catholic Church than the head is the whole body; or the diocese of Canterbury, the whole Church of England. This caution would appear frivolous, were it not necessary to avoid a childish equivocation much affected by Protestant writers, as will appear hereafter;

for it serves to cast a mist before people's eyes, and keep the true state of the question out of sight; which does more service to a weak cause than a thousand arguments.

My first proof that the Church in communion with the see of Rome is alone that Infallible Church which Christ has established, is this: because all the reformed churches frankly disown the title of "infallible." And they are very just to themselves in so doing. And as to the Greek Church (though it be a part of her faith "that the visible Church of Christ is infallible"), she cannot pretend to it with any color of reason. It follows, then, that the Church in communion with the see of Rome is the only one that has a just claim to it.

That the Greek Church can have no pretence to it is a very plain case, because a Church that has changed her faith backward and forward cannot call herself infallible. Now, the most authentic histories prove the Greek Church guilty of this change in her faith relating to the procession of the Holy Ghost and the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome; for in all other points she agrees with us, and has condemned the reformation in several councils. When Photius first began his schism—being provoked to it because the Pope (to whom he appealed, and thereby acknowledged him his superior) refused to confirm his ordination, as being irregular and uncanonical—the Greek Church was in perfect communion with the see of Rome; and there appeared no disagreement in any article of faith between the two churches. Photius made the breach, chiefly by maintaining "that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone"; and the article of supremacy followed, of course: because a subject cannot rebel against his sovereign without impeaching his authority. Photius, being the first patriarch of the East, drew, by degrees, the greatest part of the Greek Church into his error. After a long contest, and great endeavors used to bring her back to the ancient faith, she at length renounced her errors, and subscribed the condemnation of them in the general Council of Florence. The Pope's supremacy, together with other articles, was subscribed to by all the bishops of both churches (Mark of Ephesus alone

excepted), and so she was again united to the Church of Rome. But returning not long after to her vomit, she has ever since continued guilty both of heresy and schism; and Muscovy,[1] which has received its Christianity from the Greeks, is in the same condition.

This is a short and faithful account of that whole business. And if Protestants can produce any authentic history to prove the like change relating to any article of faith in the Church of Rome, then I shall freely own her to be as fallible as the Greek Church, and acknowledge that there is no such thing as an infallible Church on earth.

I prove it, secondly: In the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Church of Rome was the only Christian Church upon earth that could show a perpetual visibility from the time of the apostles down to that age. For the reformed churches began not to creep out of the shell till the year 1517; and the Greek Church, considered precisely as a schismatical Church, began about the middle of the ninth century.

Now, then, the true Church of Christ was either always visible, or she was invisible for several hundred years before the sixteenth century. If she was always visible, and if the Church of Rome was not this true Church of Christ, to which all his promises of infallibility were made, then Protestants are bound to mark out distinctly, in what other external communion, or visible society of men, the true Church of Christ subsisted for the space of fifteen hundred years before the reformation. Which if they pretend to do, then I infer these two consequences from it: 1. That the Church of England ought to have received her ordination and mission from this true visible Church of Christ, and not from the anti-Christian and idolatrous Church of Rome (as Protestants commonly style her), from which, notwithstanding, the Church of England labors all she can to prove that her ordination and mission is derived. 2. That all the reformed churches were bound to have joined themselves to the external communion of this true visible Church of Christ, and not to have set up separate communions of their

[1] A name often given, formerly, to Russia.

own. Whereas both Luther and Calvin declared publicly (as I shall show hereafter) that they had separated themselves from the whole Christian world.

But if they say that the true Church of Christ was invisible for several hundred years, then it is manifest that none of the reformed churches, at their separation from the Church of Rome, joined themselves to the true Church of Christ. For I cannot well conceive how men can either receive instructions from, or join themselves to, an invisible Church. But I am still less capable of apprehending how the Church of England could receive her ordination and mission from the hands of invisible bishops and pastors. So that this ridiculous system of an invisible Church overthrows the very pretence of any real ordination, mission, or hierarchy in that church.

Hence it follows that the Church of England at least is obliged to own that the true Church of Christ has always been visible. And since the promises of Christ were only made to his own true Church, I conclude again that they were not made to any church that ever was invisible since the time of the apostles.

Now, all the reformed churches were invisible for many hundred years, as is fairly owned by Protestant authors, whom I shall quote hereafter—the fact being wholly undeniable—and the Greek Church is actually guilty of heresy even in a fundamental point, as Protestants must likewise own; the consequence, therefore, is, that if the Church of Christ be infallible, as I have proved she is, the Roman Catholic Church alone can maintain her title to it, as having been always visible in a succession of bishops and pastors teaching one and the same faith from the beginning of Christianity down to this very time.

I prove it thirdly: The Church in communion with the see of Rome was the true Church of Christ when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, whom he styles "the beloved of God, called to be saints"; and gives God thanks "for that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world";[1] which he would not have done

[1] Rom. i. 7, 8. (See Volume I, page 16.)

had it been tainted with any error. Now, as the see of Rome was then free from error, so it is manifest that the whole Christian Church in communion with her was likewise untainted: because St. Paul says that "their faith was spoken of"—that is, preached—"throughout the whole world." The consequence whereof is, that the true Church of Christ was then only visible in that society of Christians which was united in faith and communion with her Supreme Pastor, the Bishop of Rome, who at that time was St. Peter.[1] For St. Paul had never been at Rome when he wrote that epistle, as appears from his own words (Romans i. 13; xv. 22).

Hence, I argue thus. The Church in communion with the see of Rome was once the true Church, and is owned by most Protestants—I may say all—to have continued so for some ages. Therefore, unless it can be made out with demonstrative evidence that she has since forfeited her title, she must still be acknowledged the same true Church to which all the promises of infallibility were made. I say, unless it be made out with demonstrative evidence, because nothing but demonstrative and incontestable evidence can be of any weight against a Church that ever was in possession of the truth.

This was St. Augustine's argument both against the Manichees and Donatists, who would needs reform their Mother Church. But this great champion of the Catholic faith required nothing less of them than incontestable evidence for a sufficient conviction of the Church's being in an error. The Manichees labored all they could to make him once more their proselyte. But to satisfy them that he had embraced the Catholic faith, and continued in it, upon solid grounds, he wrote thus to them: "Not to speak of the wisdom, which you do not believe is in the Catholic Church, there are many other things which most justly keep me in her communion. 1. The agreement of people and nations holds me. 2. Authority, begun with miracles, nourished with hope, increased with charity, confirmed

[1] St. Peter came to Rome in the first or second year of the Emperor Claudius, 41 or 42 A.D., and his episcopate ended with his martyrdom, 67 A.D. (See Volume I, page 13.) St. Paul wrote to the Romans A.D. 57.

by antiquity, holds me. 3. A succession of bishops descending from the see of St. Peter (to whom Christ, after his resurrection, committed his flock) to the present episcopacy, holds me. 4. Lastly, the very name of Catholic holds me; of which this Church alone has, not without reason, so kept the possession, that though all heretics desire to be called Catholics, yet if a stranger asks them where Catholics meet, none of the heretics dares point out his own house, or his own church. These, then, so many and such sacred ties of the Christian name, justly keep a man steadfast in believing the Catholic Church. But there is nothing of all this amongst you to invite or hold me. You promise truth, indeed, and make a great noise about it: and if you can make it appear with such an incontestable evidence, that no man can doubt of it, all the motives that hold me in the Catholic Church must yield to it." [1]

Here we see what St. Augustine demanded of the Manichees to prove anything against the Catholic Church, which in his time was undoubtedly the Church in communion with the see of Rome, because one of the motives that kept him in it was the succession of bishops descending from the see of St. Peter to him who was then Bishop of Rome when he wrote his book against the Manichees. Besides, St. Augustine was himself a "massing" bishop, believed there was a purgatory, prayed for his mother's soul, implored the prayers of the saints in heaven, had a great veneration for their relics, and believed that God wrought miracles by them; whereof he has left several authentic proofs in his writings. Nay, he certainly believed the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors; for why should he else mention the succession of bishops from St. Peter's see, rather than any other, as a motive that held him in the Catholic Church? All which show plainly, both that St. Augustine was a stanch Papist, and that the faith of the Catholic Church in his time, which is now about fourteen hundred years ago, was downright Popery. And, indeed, it is no small comfort for Roman Catholics that when they are now questioned about their religion, they can answer for themselves, word for word, what St. Augus-

[1] Contra Epist. Fund., c. 4.

tine says to the Manichees, which no member of any reformed Church can do without talking nonsense.

But as he demanded unquestionable evidence of the Manichees, so he required the same of the Donatists concerning the rebaptism of persons baptized by heretics; because, the Church being in possession of a constant practice of not rebaptizing them, he thought nothing less sufficient to impeach this practice than a positive declaration in Scripture that persons baptized by heretics were to be rebaptized in the Catholic Church. His words are these: "Show that the canonical Scriptures have openly declared that he who has been baptized among heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is to be baptized in the Catholic Church. . . . We demand of you some clear evidence, which needs no interpreter. (*Aliquid manifestum, quod interprete non egeat, a vobis flagitamus.*)"[1]

Since, therefore, the Church in communion with the see of Rome is acknowledged to have been formerly the true Church to which all the promises were made; since she was in possession of her title for some ages, nothing less than unquestionable evidence that she has since changed her faith can deprive her of it. Nay, this evidence, whether from Scripture or undeniable tradition, must be so clear, according to St. Augustine, that no man can doubt of it (*Veritas tam manifesta, ut in dubium venire non possit*); or (as Dr. Stillingfleet explains in his "Rational Account," page 539) "such as being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot choose but inwardly assent to it." Which the doctor required of all those that pretended to contradict the decisions of his Church, not reflecting that the first reformers never could produce any such evidence against the Roman Catholic Church. For it would have been very strange, indeed, that if there had been any such evidence against her, she should not have seen it for the space of above eight hundred years, in which the book of Protestant homilies allows her to have had possession of whole Christendom before the reformation; and it would be no less strange that the Roman Catholics in

[1] Lib. de Unit. Eccl., c. 24.

JESUS IN THE HOME OF MARTHA AND MARY

FROM THE PAINTING BY H. VAN STEINWICK THE YOUNGER

"Now it came to pass, as they went, that Jesus entered into a certain town: and a certain woman, named Martha, received him into her house: and she had a sister called Mary, who sitting also at the Lord's feet, heard his word. But Martha was busy about much serving; who stood, and said: 'Lord, hast thou no care that my sister hath left me alone to serve? Speak to her, therefore, that she help me.' And the Lord, answering, said to her: 'Martha, Martha, thou art careful, and art troubled about many things. But one thing is necessary. Mary hath chosen the best part, which shall not be taken away from her.'"

Great Britain should not be clear-sighted enough to perceive it; or, if they saw it, that they should not yield to it, when it is so much their interest to do it; and conscience, which would then be on the same side with their interest, would oblige them to it.

I prove it, fourthly: Christ committed his whole flock to St. Peter, and made him a promise that his Church should be built upon him. Christ, then, has no other Church on earth than that which is built upon St. Peter; and to this alone the promises of a perpetual assistance were made. But no other Church can be said to be built upon St. Peter than that which has St. Peter and his successors for its head; and this, no other than the Church in communion with the see of Rome, which was St. Peter's seat, as appears from the fore-mentioned passage of St. Augustine, and has always been the episcopal seat of his successors; therefore, that alone is Christ's Infallible Church on earth, as being alone the Church to which all the promises of a perpetual assistance were made; and to which no separate communion can have any title.

I prove it, fifthly: The infallibility promised by Christ must be lodged either in the Church of Rome or in some other Church from which the Church of Rome has separated herself: and then that Church in which it is lodged, and from whose communion the Church of Rome has separated herself, must in all ages have had a succession of bishops and pastors teaching a doctrine directly opposite to what is now called Popery. But no history has ever informed us of a Church wherein there has been a perpetual succession of bishops and pastors teaching a doctrine opposite to that of the Church of Rome, and from whose communion that Church separated herself; nay, the very enemies of our Church confess that "Popery reigned universally and without contradiction for many hundred years," as we shall see in the following chapter; therefore, the Infallible Church established by Christ can be no other than the Church of Rome: which Church alone can truly show a perpetual succession of bishops teaching the same doctrine from age to age, and from which all other churches went forth, and separated themselves: unless any one will say that when children run

away from their father's house, the house runs away from them; for in all the changes of religion that have ever happened, the Church of Rome has acted no other part than to keep where she was before. And so the change was in those who fell from the faith they once possessed, but not in the Church that maintained it.

I prove it, sixthly and lastly, thus: toward the end of the sixth century, when St. Gregory sent missionaries to convert England, there were only the Church in communion with the see of Rome (which was the great body of Christians spread over most nations, both of the East and West) and some separate communions consisting of the remains of Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Donatists, Pelagians, and such others, who are looked upon as heretics by Protestants themselves. These, therefore, were no part of the true Church of Christ, as being cut off from it. I ask, then, whether Christ had at that time a Church on earth, or not? If not, then whosoever pronounced this article of the Nicene Creed, "I believe One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," made profession of a falsehood; which is absurd. If he had, it was the Church then in communion with the see of Rome; and, therefore, if the Church now in communion with that see be in her faith the same she was in Pope Gregory's time, it follows manifestly, that as she was then, so she is now the only true, and, by consequence, infallible, Church of Christ on earth.

It remains, then, only to show that her faith is the same now as it was then; for proof whereof we have the concurring testimonies of historians, both Protestant and Catholic, who agree unanimously that St. Austin brought that religion into England which is now called Popery. Some Protestants, indeed, are pleased to say that it was converting England from one idolatry to another. But it is no matter in what language they express it, so they own the fact. Besides, it is notoriously known to all who have but read the Chronicles, that England never changed its faith for nine hundred years; that is, from its conversion to Christianity under Pope Gregory, till the twenty-third year of Henry VIII, whom Bishop Tillotson styles the postilion of the reformation. It is, therefore,

demonstration that Roman Catholics in Great Britain hold now the same faith and profess the same religion as was planted by St. Austin in England when it was first converted by him. And, by consequence, as St. Austin was then a member of the true Church of Christ, so Roman Catholics cannot but be so at present.

These, surely, are arguments enough, both for their number and strength, to prove a thing which will bear no manner of dispute, if there be an Infallible Church on earth; as I hope I have proved effectually there is. So that, whoever is convinced of it, must be fond of losing his labor if he goes about to seek it elsewhere than in the Roman Catholic Church. It is for this reason all Protestant writers muster up their whole strength against this article of our faith, and, when fair arguing fails them, employ their best talents to ridicule what they cannot confute; because in this dispute their all is at stake: and if this one article be proved against them, the whole reformation falls to the ground, of course, as having nothing to support it.

I am sensible, however, I have one powerful enemy to deal with, and but one. I mean the prejudices of education, which, as they are the strongest bias upon men's judgment, so are they usually of so tenacious a nature, that to reason a person out of a prepossession of a long standing, and deeply imbibed, is almost as hard a task as it would be to undertake to reason him out of his natural complexion. A Protestant who, from his tender years, has been prepossessed against the Church of Rome, and scarce ever heard of her but in libels and invectives against her, will say thus to himself: "What! Is it possible that a Church corrupted with so many errors as the Church of Rome has always been represented to me, should be infallible in her doctrine! Can such good and learned men as our preachers are deceive us!" This (though it be no more than every Jew or Mohammedan may say for himself), especially if joined with the consideration of interest, which has a very persuasive power, will suffice to frustrate the strongest and clearest proofs.

However, this shall not discourage me from doing justice to an injured Church, or endeavoring to vindicate her from the asper-

sions her enemies have thrown upon her to color their own apostasy and separation from her. In order to do it, I shall endeavor to convince the reader that the pretended errors laid to her charge are really and truly the ancient faith of the Church; that is, the doctrine taught by Christ and his apostles. For proof whereof, I shall demonstrate that no Church teaching a doctrine opposite to the pretended errors of the Church of Rome, ever appeared in the world before her. For if this can be made evident, it will follow, first, that the pretended errors of the Church of Rome have antiquity on their side, which is one necessary mark of truth, because all truths belonging to the Christian faith, being derived from Christ himself and his apostles, must of necessity be more ancient than their opposite errors. It will follow, secondly, that the doctrine of the reformation came too late into the world to be the doctrine of the apostles. By the doctrine of the reformation I mean every branch of it that is opposite to what is now called Popery.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE CHURCH OF ROME VINDICATED [1]

The state of religion in Christendom before the pretended reformation—The antiquity of the doctrine called Popery proved from Protestant writers—No Christian church teaching a doctrine opposite to Popery ever appeared in the world before it—Objections answered—The adviser's system concerning the first establishment of Popery—The capital reformer had no ordinary mission—Neither had he an extraordinary mission—Luther's doctrine concerning free-will, repentance, and good works—His doctrine concerning the legislative power—Luther no slave to truth—Declaration of the Duchess of York concerning the occasion and motives of her conversion.

MARTIN LUTHER, an Austin friar, began his pretended reformation in the year of our Lord 1517. The Greek and Latin Churches, though they had been united in the general Council of Florence, were then again divided. Muscovy [2] followed the fate of the Greek Church, and the Spanish West Indies were, as they are now, in the communion of the Church of Rome. The Greeks differed from the Latins only in the article relating to the procession of the Holy Ghost, as I have already observed; which, however, drew unavoidably after it that of the supremacy. In all other doctrinal points whatever, they agreed with the Church of Rome, as they do at present. For proof whereof, I refer the reader to the learned book entitled, " The Church of Christ Showed," etc., part 1, chapter 1, pages 10, 11, 12, 13, 14; where he may likewise be satisfied that the Nestorians, Armenians, Copts, Syrians, and Ethiopians also reject the doctrine of the reformation in all points wherein it differs from the Roman Catholic Church.

As the Latin Church, that is, the Church in communion with the see of Rome at the time when Luther set up for a reformer,

[1] This chapter is also by Cardinal Manning, and forms a sequel to Chapter XXVIII, "The Church's Infallibility." See page 529 for a sketch of the life of this eminent Catholic convert.

[2] Russia.

she was spread over all the principal kingdoms of Europe: England, Scotland, Ireland, the whole empire, with the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands, the large kingdoms of France and Spain, all Italy, with the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, etc., were all united in the same faith, acknowledging the Pope for their common Father, the true Vicar of Christ, and Supreme Head of their Church. So that Luther had not any in the whole world to communicate with. And was it not presumption even to a degree of madness for a private monk to set up his own private judgment in opposition to all Christendom, and stand single against the whole world? Truly, it would look like a dream, rather than a serious truth, were it not attested by all writers, and by Luther himself.

For in the preface to his works he boasts that he was alone at first. (*Primo solus eram.*) And in his preface to the book "de abroganda Missa privata" he writes thus: "With how many medicines and powerful evidences of Scripture have I scarce yet settled my conscience to be able alone to contradict the Pope, and to believe him Antichrist; the bishops, his apostles; and the universities, his stews? How oft did my heart tremble, and reprehend me by objecting their strongest and only argument: Art thou alone wise? And do all err?" It seems the good man had some terrible gripes of conscience before he could work himself into a belief that the successor of St. Peter was Antichrist; that all the bishops in the world were the devil's apostles; and the great nurseries of piety and learning, his stews. How troublesome is it to have too tender a conscience! But Kate Bora cured him soon after of all gripes and qualms.

Calvin owns the same truth (Epist. 141): "We have been forced," says he, "to break off from the communion of the whole world. (*A toto mundo discessionem facere coacti sumus.*)" Nay, many Protestant writers glory in Luther's separation from the whole world. "If there had been right believers," says one, "who went before Luther in his office, there had been no need of a Lutheran reformation."[1] "It is ridiculous," says another, "to think

[1] Georgius Billius, in Aug. Conf., art. 7, p. 137.

that in the time before Luther, any had the purity of doctrine, and that Luther should receive it from them."[1]

This gentleman, like a drag-net, sweeps all before him; fathers, councils, doctors; nay, I fear the apostles themselves will scarce escape.

It is, then, an incontestable truth that Luther did not only separate himself from his own Mother Church, but that there was not any preëxistent visible church of Christians in the whole world into which he could incorporate himself. But how long had the Roman Catholic Church, from whose communion he separated himself, already had a being before the reformation? This is a point of great importance, and challenges a serious examination.

It is certain she was venerable for her antiquity even at the time when Luther took upon him to reform her. For, first, all separate Christian communions then extant in the world had either gone out immediately from her, or spawned from those that had; and some of these were very ancient, as Nestorians, Eutychians, and such others.

Secondly, the first four general councils were all in communion with the Bishop of Rome. The first, of Nice, against the Arians, A.D. 325, was in communion with Pope Sylvester, whose legates, together with Osius, presided at it.

The second, of Constantinople, against the Macedonians, A.D. 381, was in communion with Pope Damasus, whom the fathers of that council, in their synodical letter to him, thank for calling them to a council as his members; and Damasus in his answer styles them his most honorable children.

The third, of Ephesus, against Nestorius, A.D. 431, was in the communion of Pope Celestine, whose legate told the council that his master was their head, and the successor of St. Peter, whose place and authority the Bishop of Rome held;[2] against which not one in the council made the least exception. So that it even proves a great deal more than is necessary for my present purpose.

[1] Bened. Morgenstern, De Ecclesia, p. 145.
[2] Act 2, tom. 3, Conc., p. 619; act 3, p. 626.

The fourth, of Chalcedon, against Eutyches and Dioscorus, A.D. 451, was in communion with St. Leo, to whom the council wrote in this manner: *Rogamus igitur, et tuis decretis honora nostrum judicium; et sicut nos capite in bonis adjecimus consonantiam, sic et summitas tua filiis quod decet adhibeat.* That is: "We desire you to honor our judgment with your decrees: and as we have agreed with our head in all good things, so may your highness grant to us, your children, that which is fitting."[1]

I only mention these four general councils, because they are allowed of by the Church of England.[2] And the time in which they were held witnesses their antiquity; for the first was held near twelve hundred years, and the last of the above a thousand and fifty years, before the reformation.

Whence it follows, first, that the Church in communion with the see of Rome not only had a being (whereof no man doubts), but was wholly incorrupt and free from errors, both from the time of the apostles to the first general council, and in the whole interval of time between that and the fourth, or last council allowed of by the Church of England. The reason is clear, because not one of the first four councils accused her of any errors; and had she been guilty of any, it cannot be doubted but those councils would have called her to an account, and condemned her, as they did the Arians, Macedonians, Nestorians, and Eutychians. Nay, it is manifest that the faith of those councils and the see of Rome was one and the same: for otherwise they would not have been in the same communion; and since the Church of England allows of those councils, it is no less manifest that she believes their faith was orthodox.

Whence it follows, secondly, that the Church of England, which owns the authority of the first four councils, must likewise acknowledge that the Roman Catholic Church, or the Church in communion with the see of Rome, was at least free from corruptions till the middle of the fifth century, in which the fourth general council was held.

[1] Conc. Chalced. in Epist. ad St. Leonem, tom. 4, p. 837, D. E.
[2] Act 1 Eliz.

Now, then, if we can but make the Popery which Luther reformed shake hands with the religion of those times; that is, if it can but be clearly proved that the very same doctrine which was professed by the Church of Rome when Luther began to reform was likewise professed by the Catholic Church in those ancient times in which she is acknowledged to have been free from corruptions: will it not be a demonstrative proof that the doctrine called Popery, and the Church which professes it, are as ancient as Christianity itself? The evidence will certainly be beyond all manner of dispute. Let us, then, make some inquiry into this important matter, and see how far the doctrine called Popery may be traced, even from the concessions of such Protestant writers as are beyond exception.

First: Bishop Tillotson ("Sermons," page 588) writes thus: "In the beginning of the reformation, when Antichrist sat securely in the quiet possession of his kingdom, Luther arose," etc. These words, "securely" and in the "quiet possession," must be owned to be very emphatic; though I cannot draw any positive consequence from them as to the number of years which that secure and quiet possession had already lasted: but since so learned a man as the bishop was, could not be ignorant of it, it is probable he foresaw the advantage we should make of it, had he been too particular; and, therefore, judged it not safe to speak out, but chose rather to leave the reader in the dark, than let him know more than was fitting for him.

Perkins, in his "Exposition upon the Creed," page 400, ventures to be a little plainer. His words are these: "We say that before the days of Luther, for the space of many hundred years, an universal apostasy overspread the whole face of the earth, and that our Church was not then visible in the world." Here Popery, which the author is pleased to call "an universal apostasy," is owned to have "overspread the whole face of the earth for many hundred years" before the days of Luther. However, he did not think it proper to specify, as he might have done, how many hundred years this universal apostasy had already lasted. But every intelligent

reader will be apt to guess that when a man says "many hundred years," he does not mean a very small number.

But the Protestant Homily Book, in order to set forth in the most pathetic manner the danger of Popery, which the composer has the charity to call "abominable idolatry"; this book, I say (the authority whereof cannot be questioned), has ventured to explain some part of Perkins's "many hundred years." The words are as follows: "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned; all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom, had been at once drawn in abominable idolatry; and that for the space of eight hundred years and more."[1]

Here, then, we have "eight hundred years," with a "more" at the end of them, allowed to Popery before the reformation. The word "more" may be made to signify as much, or as little, as every one pleases. But it may modestly be extended so far as to make the total number amount to about nine hundred years in all; which brings universal Popery to St. Gregory's time, who transplanted it into England; where it flourished just nine hundred years before the reformation. So that now we have brought it safe to the beginning of the seventh century: that is, within a hundred and fifty years of the fourth general council: and now I have only this small interval of time to provide for it; which if I can do with the help of a good Protestant guide, it will easily find its way to the very time of the apostles.

But I have luckily met with one who even outgoes my wishes, and has conducted Popery not only to the fourth, but even beyond the first great general Council of Nice. The person I speak of is Mr. Napier, who, in his book upon the Revelations (Prob. 37, page 68), is so sincere as to own that Popery, which he cannot forbear giving an ugly name to, reigned universally in the very beginning of the fourth century, and under the first Christian emperor that ever was in the world. But lest any one should, through mistake, think Mr. Napier to be an obscure or inconsiderable writer, Mr. Collier, in his Historical Dictionary, has taken care to publish

[1] Hom. against Peril of Idolatry, Part III, p. 251 (London, 1687).

his merits, for he styles him a "profound scholar, and of great worth."

This learned and worthy person, then, writes thus: "From the year of Christ three hundred and sixteen, the antichristian and papistical reign has begun: reigning universally, and without any debatable contradiction, one thousand two hundred and sixty years." And again (chapter xi, page 145): "The Pope and clergy have possessed the outward visible Church, even one thousand two hundred and sixty years." I presume he counts to the time that the reformation was established in Great Britain.

This, however, is precise and clear, though the other three gentlemen were more or less upon the reserve. Tillotson has only favored us with a broad hint. Perkins, indeed, allows Popery many hundred years; but is careful not to let us know how many. The Homilist gives it eight hundred years and more; but his "more" is like a string that may be let out or drawn in as much as every one shall fancy. But the learned and worthy Napier speaks boldly, and may serve as a comment upon the other three. For we are certified by him that the papistical reign began from the year of Christ three hundred and sixteen; that is, precisely a year more than twelve hundred before Luther commenced reformer. What pity is it that he has not specified the very day of the month on which Popery began its universal reign! For when his hand was in, he might have done the one with as much ease as the other; and then Papists might have had the pleasure to keep the anniversary feast of its accession to the empire of the universal Christian world.

But though Mr. Napier has done Popery a considerable service, by allowing it a universal reign even in the beginning of the fourth century, yet the four Protestant annalists commonly called the Magdeburgians carry it still higher, and stick not to date their pretended "decay of the Christian doctrine," and the "straw and stubble of papistical errors," as they call them, even from the age immediately after Christ and his apostles. Thus God has confounded the enemies of his Church by making them become witnesses of the truth against their wills, and proclaim the antiquity

of her faith in those very writings which they intended for the sharpest invectives against it.

Upon the whole, I cannot but make this observation, namely: If Popery had its beginning in any age since the time of the apostles, it is morally impossible but so considerable an event must have been transmitted to posterity—I will not say by one or two historians of note, but by hundreds, who would have marked out the time when it happened with such an unquestionable certainty that it would have been impossible either to doubt of it or differ in opinions about it. Thus we know exactly the very year when Arianism and Lutheranism began. The facts were never questioned by any man in the world; and the certainty of them leaves no room for any diversity of opinions about them.

If, then, there were any ancient records, or authentic history, that fixed precisely the time when Popery began, would not all Protestants have quoted them for the chronology of a fact which must have sunk the credit of the Church of Rome, to all intents and purposes, and established the reformed churches upon the most solid foundation? It is very sure they never would have overlooked an advantage of that importance; nay, every man of learning would have had it without book, and the date of every branch of Popery would have been as well known as that of the reformation, concerning which there never were two opinions among thousands that have written of it.

Since, therefore, instead of this unanimous agreement in fixing the time that Popery began, we find nothing but cutting and shuffling, precarious guesses, and diversity of opinion among the very best Protestant writers, it is a demonstrative proof that they have no ancient or authentic records concerning any beginning of it since the time of the apostles. And we may justly conclude, that, as it reigned universally for many hundred years before the reformation, according to Perkins; for eight hundred years and more, according to the Book of Homilies; for above twelve hundred years, according to Mr. Napier; and is owned by the Magdeburgians to have had a being even in the second century; we may conclude, I

say, that it never had any other beginning than that of Christianity, namely, from Christ himself and his apostles. But this argument shall be treated at large hereafter.

I observe, secondly, that the old childish whim of introducing Popery in the monkish ages (as Protestants style them) of pretended ignorance and darkness is quite thrown out of doors both by the Homilist and Mr. Napier. For in the beginning of the fourth century there were no monks at all, as Protestants understand the word; and though there were several monasteries of them in the beginning of the seventh, yet what Protestants call monkish ages are of a much later date; and so the pretended ignorance and darkness of those ages could not favor the introduction of Popery, which, according to the Book of Homilies, was fully established long before. This shall likewise be fully handled hereafter.

But to return once more to the learned Mr. Napier, whose chronology relating to the grand epoch of Popery is very curious. We see he fixes it precisely in the year of Christ 316; that is, nine years before the first great general Council of Nice, which was held A.D. 325. Nay, he tells us expressly that even then it reigned universally: so that it may be truly said, in Bishop Tillotson's language, that even then "Antichrist sat securely in the quiet possession of his kingdom." Very strange! Unless we had some information how he got into it. For a kingdom of so vast an extent as the whole Christian world is not usually got in huggermugger, or, like a purse, by stealth.

However that may be, it follows evidently from Mr. Napier's chronology, that the fathers of the Nicene Council, though allowed of and respected by Protestants themselves, were all stanch Papists. And what is very remarkable, many of the bishops of that council were eminent saints, and carried about them the glorious marks of their past sufferings for the faith of Christ.

I ask, then, whether the bishops of the Nicene Council had been Papists from their infancy, or not? If so, then without all dispute they had been brought up by Papists, and so Popery is still more ancient than Mr. Napier makes it. But if they had not

been Papists from their infancy, then they were all infamous apostates—St. Athanasius among the rest. And is it not very strange that not one of them should be touched with remorse, nor represent to the council his fall from the ancient religion, nor exhort them to a reformation; especially when the supposed change from one religion to another was of so fresh a date that there was not a bishop in the council but must have been concerned in it?

But it is still more wonderful that the Arians, their mortal enemies, who were admitted to, and heard in, the council, should not reproach them with their apostasy, and so put them to open shame. And yet the acts and histories of that council mention no such thing. Nay, Eusebius himself, who was present at it, and has written the history of the Church down to this time, knew nothing of any universal apostasy from the primitive faith of the Church to Popery. For had he known it, it is incredible he would have passed it over in silence. And therefore, since neither he nor those that wrote immediately after him have left us any history, record, or monument of any change in the faith of the universal visible Church introduced before their time, it is manifest there never was any such change; and, by consequence, the Popery which Mr. Napier owns to have reigned universally even nine years before the Council of Nice, was the very religion that had been handed down to them from the apostles themselves.

But I shall now set aside these testimonies of Protestant writers, which witness the antiquity of the Roman Catholic faith, and endeavor to take a more effectual way to prove it, without being at the courtesy of any Protestant evidence to vouch for it. But (to avoid an unnecessary multiplicity of words) as all the pretended errors of the Church of Rome are briefly expressed by the word Popery; so the doctrine of the reformation, as it is directly opposite to it, shall for brevity sake be called Protestancy. Because I shall have occasion to repeat them both frequently, and it is no matter what names we give them, so we but understand one another.

Now the whole question is, whether the doctrine called Protestancy, or that which is called Popery, has a fairer title to antiquity.

If Protestancy be the true Christian doctrine which was taught by the apostles, it must have had a being in the world preëxistent to that of Popery; and there must have happened a "total change from Protestancy to Popery" in some age or other since the time of the apostles. For without this change, Popery could not have got possession of the universal visible Church, as it certainly had at the beginning of the reformation, when the courageous Martin Luther stood alone against the whole Christian world.

It shall, therefore, be my task to demonstrate that there never happened any such change, or, which amounts to the same, "that no Church teaching a doctrine opposite to the pretended errors of the Church of Rome ever appeared in the world before her"; which if it be made evident, the consequence will be, that the doctrine called Popery is as ancient as Christianity itself, and has been handed down to us from Christ and his apostles.

But it is very necessary the reader should here observe that Popery in general may be divided into two parts, namely, the discipline and the faith of the Church of Rome. The proper object of faith is all revealed truths, which are the same in all ages, nor can any authority upon earth pretend to make the least change in them. But the discipline of the Church, being not of divine revelation but human institution, is doubtless changeable: because the same legislative power which can make laws and regulations for the public good, may likewise, for just reasons, alter, suspend, or repeal the laws or regulations it has made.

Thus the ancient penitential canons, though they were in force for some ages, have not been binding for many hundred years past. Thus, likewise, the Council of Trent regulated the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity otherwise than they were before. Nay, even the apostolical constitution of the Council of Jerusalem which forbids blood, and things of blood, and things strangled (Acts xv. 29), remained not long in force, but as the motive ceased, the obligation became void, of course. For let laws be ever so good in themselves, they are not good at all times, nor in all places.

Now, then, when I pretend to prove "that the doctrine called

Popery is as ancient as Christianity," I mean not the discipline, but the faith of the Church of Rome. For it is absurd to maintain that regulations of discipline, which came gradually into the Church and have been subject to variations, are as ancient as the Church itself.

It is, however, a common practice, though a very unfair one, among Protestant writers, when they design to charge the Church of Rome with novelty, to confound the one with the other, and to exemplify promiscuously in points of faith or discipline, as if they were upon the same footing; whereas, to say anything to the purpose against that Church, they must prove precisely that she differs in some article of faith or revealed doctrine from the ancient orthodox Church. All matters of discipline must therefore be thrown out of the question; and whatever objection is made from that head is but trifling, whether the facts objected be true or false.

It is morally impossible that a considerable revolution should happen either in Church or state without being ever taken notice of by any historian writing in or about the time when it happened. Nay, the thing is contrary not only to experience, but to the very immediate end of history, which is to instruct posterity in the knowledge of what has happened in former ages; and though transactions of the greatest moment may be mangled and disguised by authors, according as they are affected, they can never be wholly overlooked or omitted by them.

This is particularly true in reference to any considerable changes in religion: because such changes, being the constant source of extraordinary events, by causing disturbances and many times entire revolutions in the state, can never escape the notice of an historian. And a person may as soon make me believe the greatest contradiction in nature, as that such changes may really happen and not be mentioned in any history of that state or kingdom in which they happened.

What historian has ever written the life of Queen Elizabeth but made the changes in religion, and the establishment of the reformation in England, the principal subject of his history? The same may be said of those who wrote the lives of the first Christian

emperors, whose histories are all filled with ample relations of the heresies that started up in their times, and the disturbances they occasioned both in Church and state; the opposition they met with; the princes that favored them; the fathers that wrote against them; the councils wherein they were condemned; etc. Nay, I dare challenge any Protestant to name me one considerable heresy—I mean, what both Papists and Protestants own to be a heresy—whereof there is not a particular account in some history of note. As who was the first author of it; where and when it was first broached; what progress it made; what influence it had upon the affairs of Christendom; what bishops opposed it; what books were written against it; what councils called to condemn it; and other such particulars as are a full evidence for the truth of the main fact.

Hence I infer, first, that a universal silence of historians in relation to any considerable change in matters of religion is a proof amounting to a moral demonstration that there never happened any such change.

I infer, secondly, that to accuse any church of gross errors, whereof no particular author or beginning is to be found in any authentic record, is a mere groundless charge, and cannot be maintained with any color of justice or reason.

It is upon these two principles I shall ground my argument to prove that the doctrine called Popery is as ancient as Christianity; and I have endeavored to set the whole matter in as clear a light as is possible in the following manner.

If the doctrine called Popery be not as ancient as Christianity, then Protestancy, as far as it is directly opposite to it, must be the religion which Christ and his apostles established in the world. I presume all Protestants will readily grant this. Nay, if I am not under a very great mistake, it is what they principally contend for. Because the most plausible thing they can say for themselves is that the whole business of the reformation was to recover religion from the " corruptions " introduced into it and bring it back to its ancient purity.

But it follows hence that there have been two great changes

in the state of the Christian religion since its first establishment by Christ and his apostles. The first, from Protestancy to Popery (for Popery had full possession of the whole visible Church for many hundred years before the reformation); the second, from Popery to Protestantism, which was effected by that reformation. These two changes, therefore, must be clearly made out from the incontestable evidence of authentic histories and records. For if it cannot be thus evidently proved that the first change, namely, "from Protestancy to Popery," happened as really and truly as the second, namely, "Popery to Protestantism," then it will follow that Protestancy never had a being before Popery; the consequence whereof will be that Popery had its beginning from the very time of the apostles.

Now, these two changes, if they both really happened, may be called at least equally great. Nay, the first, namely, "from Protestancy to Popery," appears evidently far more difficult than the second, by reason of some doctrines in the Church of Rome which, if they were not taught by the apostles, could never be introduced but with the greatest difficulty imaginable. I shall instance a few.

First, it being a principle of Protestancy, as well as Popery, that Christ alone has the power of instituting sacraments, because he alone can appoint proper instruments to convey his grace to our souls: if Protestancy, which allows but of two sacraments, was the religion taught by the apostles and established in the infancy of the Church, I leave any man of common sense to judge whether five new ones, never heard of in the time of the apostles, could have been afterward imposed upon the Church, and rendered an article of her faith, without the greatest difficulty and the most vigorous opposition, at least for some time. Would not every good Protestant bishop have immediately stood in the gap, and cried out against such a monstrous innovation? Would they not have written against it, and alleged that Christ had instituted but two sacraments, that the apostles never had preached but two, that the number, precisely, of two, and no more, had been handed down to them by the immediate successors of the apostles; and that, therefore, no

human power could make any addition to it without impiety and sacrilege? Finally, would they not have stigmatized the first authors of such an innovation, and cut them off from the communion of the Church? It is certainly most rational to judge that the bishops and pastors then in being, if they were of the religion which Protestants now confess, would have exerted their utmost zeal and authority in a case of that importance—unless we suppose they were all lain asleep with opium, or doted and knew nothing of the matter; for no man hitherto has ever heard or read one word of any opposition or resistance made to the coining of any one of the five sacraments which are now denied by Protestants; or of any disturbance that has ever happened in the Church about it. Very strange, that such a change should ever happen without noise or trouble; or, if there were disturbances about it, that no historian should give us any information of it!

Secondly, I should be glad to know by what secret charm the Mass got admittance into the Universal Church, if it was neither instituted by Christ nor introduced by the practice of the apostles themselves. For, if the Popish doctrine relating to it, namely, "that it is a true sacrifice, or an external oblation of the real body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine, ordained by Christ himself at his Last Supper"; if this, I say, be false doctrine, we cannot doubt but that the apostles and their immediate successors were wholly strangers to it; and that, by consequence, none of the primitive bishops or priests ever said Mass, as being all true Protestants in this as well as other articles of faith.

Here, then, lies the stress of the difficulty, namely: How all the bishops and priests in the world, having been brought up, as we must suppose, in the principles of the Protestant religion, and, by consequence, in a total ignorance both of the doctrine and use of the Mass, should afterward not only unanimously agree to embrace this new scheme of religious worship, but even to regard it as the most sacred and solemn part of the public devotion of the Church. What! could all this be done without contradiction, noise, or trouble! Or, if there were contentions, schisms, and disputes

about it, as it is morally impossible but there must have been, unless the whole thing be a fiction, could events of that importance escape the notice of all historians!

But, thirdly: Sacramental confession has its peculiar difficulty, for it is not a mere speculative point, but of all practical duties the most repugnant to human nature; and I dare say no man would ever have submitted to it who was not first convinced that he could not be saved without it. But what increases the difficulty of introducing the practice of it, is, that no dignity, whether in Church or state, ever exempted any member of the Church of Rome from the obligation of it. All bishops, kings, and princes—nay, emperors and Popes themselves—have an equal share in the burden with the very meanest of the laity. They must all fall prostrate at the feet of their confessors, discover their most hidden sins, submit them to their censure, and perform the penance enjoined them.

Now, if this was not the doctrine of the apostles; if all the Popes and bishops of the primitive Church were brought up in the principles of the reformation; finally, if the obligation of auricular confession be a Popish error, and was, by consequence, unknown to antiquity: then I cannot forbear asking this question, Which of the two is the more surprising, the extravagance of those who first took a fancy to impose this heavy yoke both on themselves and others, or the weakness of those who submitted to it? For that it was effectually submitted to is plain matter of fact. But since the very attempt of introducing a novelty (if it really was one) so burdensome and odious was no better than a mad and extravagant undertaking, can any one imagine it met not with very great opposition in the beginning, and put the whole Church into disorder and confusion? Is it not natural to suppose that both the laity and clergy rose up in defence of the Christian liberty their forefathers had enjoyed, and alleged that since all Christians before them had been saved without stooping to the yoke of confession, they saw no reason but they might be saved upon the same easy terms? And would not all these particulars (had they really happened) have been recorded in some history of note? Truly, who-

ever believes the contrary is capable of swallowing any improbability whatsoever.

This, therefore, is an incontestable truth, namely, that a change from Protestancy to Popery, in the particulars I have specified, could not be effected without great opposition, nor, by consequence, without occasioning troubles and schisms in the Church. For further proof whereof, let us suppose that a set of men should at present attempt to introduce the number of seven sacraments, the Mass, auricular confession, or any noted branch of Popery, into the Church of England; and I appeal to the judgment of all men in their senses, whether those religious zealots would not meet with a very warm opposition from all the bishops and the whole English clergy.

We have an instance of a fresh date of their episcopal zeal for the Protestant religion in the reign of King James II, who only endeavored to compel them to order his proclamation for liberty of conscience to be read in all the churches. But the world knows what success he met with, and the history of the seven golden candlesticks will never be forgotten. Their zeal threw the whole nation into a flame, and Whitehall became soon after too warm for that unfortunate prince. If, therefore, Protestancy was the religion established by Christ and his apostles, and professed in the infancy of the Church, can we imagine the good primitive bishops, who were so ready to lay down their lives for the Church, were not full as zealous against Popery as those of the Church of England? Or that they were not ready to stand in the gap, and oppose the torrent with their utmost strength, when they saw it flowing in upon the Church?

But such an imagination being wholly groundless, it follows that what I have undertaken to prove is an undeniable truth, namely, that the first supposed change from Protestancy to Popery could not be effected with less difficulty than the second, from Popery to Protestancy. Nay, to speak naturally, the difficulty to effect it, and, by consequence, the opposition made to it, must have been much greater, for the reasons I have given.

Now, no man of any reading can be so ignorant as not to know with what difficulty and opposition the second change, called the reformation, was begun, carried on, and at last effected. Innumerable histories are filled with ample relations of the obstinate and bloody wars it occasioned in Germany, France, the Low Countries, and other kingdoms and states. They all tell us with what vigor it was opposed by Leo X and the following Popes; by the Emperor Charles V; by Francis I of France and his successors; and even by Henry VIII, under whom great numbers suffered in Smithfield for that cause. Finally, the history of the Council of Trent, in which it was condemned, is known by all men of learning, so that no man can doubt of the truth of a fact so particularized and circumstantiated in all histories written upon that subject.

Here, then, I may justly demand of Protestants the same satisfactory account of the first supposed change from Protestancy to Popery. For since they were always equally opposite, and the same causes produce naturally the same effects, no rational man will ever be made to believe that a change from Popery to Protestancy in a few kingdoms only should occasion such a number of remarkable events, cause so many bloody wars, such disturbances in the Church and revolutions in the state, and that an entire change from Protestancy to Popery should not be attended with any of the like effects.

I desire, therefore, some tolerable account of the particular circumstances of this change. As: Who were the principal actors in it? In what age it happened? Whether it came in by degrees, or all at once? If all at once, then we must either suppose that the whole Christian world went to bed Protestants and rose Papists the next morning by unanimous consent; or that a formidable body of Papists, like Cadmus's armed men, rose out of the ground, and in a trice cut the throats of all true Protestants in the world; or, finally, that Popery dropped from the clouds, and got full possession of the Universal Church, without being perceived by anybody till the clear-sighted Martin Luther made the happy discovery. For truly I can think of no other way to render it possible that it should get admittance all at once, or without opposition, noise, or trouble.

This, however, being somewhat out of the way, and proper only for machinery exploits upon the theatre, I must rather suppose Protestants will say it came in by degrees. But, then, it is reasonable they should give me a satisfactory answer to a few questions, and prove the truth of the facts from unquestionable records. For if Popery came in by degrees, it got footing first in one place, then in another, as the reformation did in Germany, Switzerland, and Geneva, before it crossed the seas to visit England. So that we must suppose there were Protestant and Popish states and kingdoms for some time in former ages, as there have been ever since the reformation. I ask, then, Where it was that Popery made its first entrance? Was it in the east or west, south or north? What kingdom, state, or nation abjured the Protestant religion first? Who was the first Popish Bishop of Rome, emperor, or king? What Protestant and Popish kings were contemporary? What wars happened in their several reigns about religion? What books were written for and against Popery? What Protestant councils were called to condemn it? And, lastly, by what name were those who adhered to the ancient Protestant religion distinguished from the others who embraced Popery? For I am sensible that Protestants and Papists are names invented since the reformation. And since it is highly improbable that two such different communions or religions as those of the reformation and the Church of Rome should be at any time in the world without names to distinguish them, because even the most inconsiderable sect never wanted a name, I should be glad to know what their names were in former ages, that is, from the time that Popery first got footing in some particular state or kingdom till its full establishment in the universal visible Church. I could ask a great many more puzzling questions, but I should be satisfied if Protestants can but answer the few I have put, and produce unquestionable authority for proof of their answers: as Papists can do to prove every material circumstance of the reformation; and as both Protestants and Papists can do in reference to any considerable heresy that ever was broached in the Church. But if they can give no tolerable account of the fore-mentioned particu-

lars, as I am sure they must be conscious to themselves they cannot; if there never was an historian in the world that wrote the history of the wonderful change from Protestancy to Popery, under whatever names you please, as there are hundreds who have written the history of the reformation: then it is reasonable to conclude that the supposed change is a mere fiction, and that any Grub-street tale has full as good a foundation.

I doubt not, however, but that, by the art of invention, some ingenious hypothesis may be made; an imaginary scheme may be formed to show the metaphysical possibility of a thing that never has happened nor ever will happen. But this way will not do. I demand not the invention of a fruitful brain, but plain facts, and good history to prove them. Nothing less will satisfy me, nor indeed any man who is not fond of being deceived. I desire to know the true history of Popery—I mean not that Popery which was established everywhere upon the ruins of paganism, whereof I have already given a very good account; but of that Popery which we suppose to be the younger sister of Protestantism. I desire to know when and where this unfortunate babe, so hated and persecuted by the best-natured people in Europe, was born, where she was nursed, who were her parents and masters, what memorable adventures she met with when she made her first appearance, by what trick or sleight she got the inheritance away from Protestancy, her supposed elder sister—nay, and maintained the full possession of it for many hundred years: in a word, how she came to be mistress of the whole Christian world. These are the most material points for which I demand authentic history; and till I have some good account of them, I shall continue, with a very safe and easy conscience, in my belief that the religion which now is called Popery is as ancient as Christianity, and that it never had any other beginning than what Christ and his apostles gave it.

Though the gentlemen of the reformation may find it too hard a task to inform us how Popery in general got into the Church, they may, perhaps, be able to give us a better account of some particular branches of it. I shall, therefore, to avoid being tedious, choose only

one of the three I have already spoken of. I mean the Mass, which, being the most solemn worship both of the Greek and the Latin Church, could not easily steal into the world without being perceived, if it had not its beginning from Christ and his apostles. I must likewise observe that the Mass is, in the opinion of most Protestants, the very rankest part of Popery, and the most hated by them. Witness the sanguinary laws made against it in Queen Elizabeth's time. And therefore, if Protestancy was established in the world before Popery, I leave any man of sense to judge whether the Mass could get admittance without the greatest difficulty and resistance imaginable.

However, I shall give one remarkable, positive proof of its antiquity; and I make choice of it because every Englishman who has but read the Chronicles will easily apprehend the force of it. England was converted from Saxon paganism to Christianity toward the end of the sixth century; that is, about five hundred years before the Norman Conquest, and about nine hundred years before the reformation. The persons who converted it were sent from Rome by Pope Gregory the Great; and, we may be sure, preached and established the religion of the place from whence they came, which at that time flourished in all parts of the Christian world. The religion they brought over with them continued in England, without any alteration, from its first establishment till the pretended reformation: as the Book of Homilies plainly owns in telling us that before the reformation "whole Christendom had been drowned in abominable idolatry for the space of eight hundred years and more"; for I presume England was a part of the Christendom it speaks of.

Hence it follows, first, that as Popery was the religion of England in the beginning of the reformation, so it was that very religion to which it was converted nine hundred years before by St. Austin and his fellow-missionaries.

It follows, secondly, that the Mass and Christianity came together into England. Because, as I have already observed, it cannot be doubted but that they who brought their religion from

Rome, and received all their directions from thence, as St. Austin and his fellow-laborers did even in things of much less moment (witness holy Bede's history of England); it cannot be doubted, I say, but they established the same form of worship in England as was practised at Rome.

Now, that Mass was at that time said at Rome is manifest from St. Gregory's Eighth Homily upon the Gospels, where we find these remarkable words: *Quia largienti domino missarum solemnia ter hodie celebraturi sumus, loqui diu de evangelica lectione non possumus.* That is, "Since, God willing, I shall say Mass thrice to-day, I cannot be very long in my discourse upon the Gospel." This was spoken by St. Gregory on Christmas Day, which is the only day in the whole year on which every Roman Catholic priest says Mass thrice. And it is an unanswerable proof that the Mass was so well established in the Church of Rome at the time when England was converted, that even the custom of saying three Masses on Christmas Day, which is but a point of discipline, was then observed in that Church.

But it follows, thirdly, that at the time when England was converted the Mass was the public worship of the whole Christian Church; because we read nowhere that there was any schism or disagreement about that article in Pope Gregory's time.

Here, then, we have a clear and intelligible account that the Mass was established in the whole Christian Church nine hundred years before the reformation; and so well established that no man can, with any color or probability of reason, pretend it was then a new thing; and if any one should pretend it, I can produce unquestionable authority to disprove him.

The most ancient of the fathers have left us an account of the manner of celebrating Mass in their times: as St. Justinus Martyr (Apol. 2); the author of the Apostolic Constitutions (lib. 2, c. 57, and lib. 8, c. 5 *et seq.*); St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. 5, Mystag.). Besides, all learned men own St. Basil and St. Chrysostom to be the authors of the liturgies that bear their names and are to this day used in the Greek Church. The Roman liturgy is likewise very

ancient, as appears from the Sacramentary, or Ritual, of Pope Gregory the Great, who abridged the Liturgy of Pope Gelasius, a father of the fifth age; and he only put it into some better order, with a few inconsiderable alterations made in it. So that any impartial reader of antiquity will find the whole Church at Mass in the fourth and fifth centuries, and a cloud of venerable witnesses to attest it.

But I shall in a few words trace it even to the third and second centuries; and that with the help of four substantial Protestant witnesses: I mean the four Magdeburgians, or Centuriators, who very honestly own the fact in censuring St. Ignatius (the disciple of St. John), the holy martyr Irenæus, St. Cyprian, St. Martial, and Tertullian for teaching the doctrine of the Mass; the substance or essence whereof consists precisely in being "an unbloody sacrifice offered to God by the priests of the new law upon an altar"; or, what amounts to the same, "an external oblation of the body and blood of Christ under the forms of bread and wine." For, as to the ceremonies, they belong only to the decency or solemnity, but are no part of the substance of the Mass. And therefore, as they were gradually introduced in the primitive ages, so, if the Church thought fitting, she might even now make alterations in them.

This being premised, let us see what the Centuriators have blamed in the fore-mentioned fathers of the second and third ages. St. Ignatius is censured by them for using these words, *Offerre et immolare sacrificium* (Epist. ad Smern.), "to immolate, or offer sacrifice"; St. Irenæus, for saying "that Christ had taught a new oblation in the New Testament, which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, does offer throughout the whole world" (Iren., lib. 4, c. 32). St. Cyprian is accused of superstition for saying that "the priest is Christ's representative, and offers sacrifice to God the Father" (Cypr., lib. 2, c. 3). They reprehend Tertullian for using the words *Sacrificium offerre*, "to offer sacrifice" (Lib. de Cœna Domini); and St. Martial for saying that "sacrifice is offered to God the Creator upon the altar."

Here is a plain confession of four Protestant writers that Mass was said in the second and third centuries, and five eminent fathers

of those ages are quoted for it. St. Ignatius had received his doctrine from St. John himself, and been eye-witness of his actions; and the rest lived so near the time of the apostles that I dare presume to say they were somewhat better acquainted with what they had taught and practised than the pretended reformers, who appeared in the world some twelve or thirteen hundred years after. Yet then it was that this august and venerable sacrifice, which the prophet Malachi had foretold "should be offered up to God from east to west";[1] which, for near fifteen hundred years together, had been the relief of departed souls, the consolation of the just, and the sanctuary of sinners, was, by the impiety of a few miscreants, rendered the object of hatred and contempt, and banished out of the Church, as far as in them lay.

However this be, I am sensible I have proved more than I needed: because my only business is to put Protestants to their proof concerning the beginning of the Mass. I am but the defendant; they are the plaintiffs. They are, therefore, bound to make good their charge, and show that the Mass is a Popish invention, and has no foundation in the doctrine of Christ and his apostles; that the primitive Christians knew nothing of it; and that, by consequence, it had its beginning in some age distant from the time of the apostles.

I have already given my reason to show the moral impossibility of introducing it without the greatest opposition, noise, and trouble, in case the primitive Church was wholly a stranger to it. I have also made it evident that changes, contests, and troubles can never happen in Church or state without being recorded in some history of the times in which they happened. If, therefore, the Mass be without foundation in the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, if the use of it was unknown in the primitive Church, I desire any Protestant, for the credit and reputation of his cause and the satisfaction of tender consciences, to let us know the names of the writers who lived about the time when the Mass was first brought into the Church and have written the history of it. For I presume it is from

[1] Mal. i. 11.

THE FIVE HOLY ONES

FROM THE PAINTING BY RAPHAEL

them we should certainly learn who were the first inventors or promoters of it; how, where, and when such an extraordinary novelty was first brought into credit. And surely they will not conceal from us one very remarkable particular, namely, who was the first "massing" Pope, bishop, or priest. I expect we shall also be informed what resistance it met with; who were the zealous Protestant bishops that opposed it; what disturbances it raised; in what councils it was condemned; and with what reluctance the people were at first brought to be present at it.

These, surely, and other such remarkable facts, will be the subject of the histories written in or about the time in which they happened. But if no account of them appears in any ancient or credible history, I must repeat what I have already laid down as a principle, namely, that such a silence, in a matter of the greatest importance, is a proof amounting to a moral demonstration that they never happened at all; that the pretended change from a total denial or ignorance of the Mass to an entire establishment of it is altogether fictitious; and that, by consequence, the Mass had its beginning from the institution of Christ and the doctrine and practice of the apostles, according to St. Augustine's judgment, who, writing against the Donatists, gives this for a rule: "That when any doctrine is found generally received in the visible Church, in any age whatsoever, whereof there is no certain author or beginning to be found; then it is sure that such a doctrine came down from Christ and his apostles." [1]

If any one pretends that the Mass crept in by insensible degrees, and so made no noise or disturbances to be taken notice of by any historian, the answer is so very weak that I am almost ashamed to confute it seriously. For, first: The thing is without example; and I defy Protestants to produce one single instance of the like nature in any considerable heresy owned as such by both sides. For let them name what heresy they please, as that of the Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Pelagians, Donatists, Novatians, etc.; they all caused great disturbances in the Church; histories of

[1] Lib. 4, de Bap., c. 6, v. 24; as also Lib. de Unit. Eccl., c. 19.

them have been written; and we can show how, where, and when they began, what progress they made, what fate they met with, and other particulars: and to pretend that Popery alone, supposing it to be a compound of gross errors, or any branch of it, but particularly the Mass, should steal into the Church like a thief in the night, without being perceived or opposed by anybody, is as mere a whim as ever was hatched in a distracted brain.

But, secondly: The thing will appear to be altogether impracticable, if we consider how watchful the Church has always been in discovering any heresy, and how vigorous in opposing the growth of it; so that many have been suppressed at their very appearance, as Quietism was toward the end of the seventeenth century. And it is an undeniable truth that the Church has exerted herself with the same watchfulness and vigor in all ages, without the least regard to the dignity or character of the persons who, by mistake or otherwise, endeavored to corrupt the purity of the Christian faith.

Thus, though Tertullian and Origen were two great pillars of the Church in their time, and their orthodox writings are justly valued by all men of learning, yet the Church was watchful enough to discover the tares that grew up among the wheat; and the reputation neither of their wit nor learning could save their errors from being condemned. The same may be said of some errors held by Lactantius, Arnobius, Cassianus, and others, which could not escape the watchful eye of the Church, and were accordingly censured by her. Nay, what is most remarkable, the error of the holy bishop and martyr, St. Cyprian, who was a man of an extraordinary character, was very warmly opposed, and underwent the same fate. So true it is that the Church has always been extremely jealous of the purity of her faith; watchful in detecting the least error against it; and inflexible in doing justice upon it. And is it, then, possible that a thing so odious to Protestants as the Mass should either creep into the Church without being perceived, or, if perceived, should not be immediately opposed and condemned? Is it probable that the "gross errors" of Popery should be the only criminals that escaped the hands of justice? But the thing is so very gross in itself,

so contradictory to experience and inconsistent with reason, that it confutes itself. I shall add two short remarks of no small importance.

I observe, first, that if the reformed religion had antiquity on its side, Martin Luther, the first and principal reformer, who neither wanted wit nor learning, would not have overlooked or slighted an advantage of that importance, because the ancient religion is certainly the true one. And, therefore, since it is an undeniable fact that this capital reformer, instead of appealing to the ancient fathers, treated them as professed enemies—nay, declared in express terms, as will appear hereafter, that fathers, councils, and the practice of ages were against him—it follows that the doctrine of the reformation can lay no claim to antiquity, but has the infamous mark of novelty stamped upon it.

I observe, secondly, that though I have named several of the ancient fathers who were censured for particular error, I have never heard of any father or doctor of the Church, in all antiquity, who ever was censured for any Popish error—I mean, for any of those pretended errors which Protestants call Popery, as the Mass, purgatory, invocation of saints, etc.; which, however, are clearly found in their writings. This is a demonstration that the ancient Church did not look upon them as errors, but as orthodox doctrine. For had they been looked upon as errors, they could not have escaped the censure of the Church. As, for instance, the doctrine of the Mass would have been no less censured in St. Cyprian than his teaching the rebaptism of persons baptized by heretics; and since the one was really condemned, and not the other, it is an unanswerable proof that the Mass was held to be the doctrine of Christ and his apostles.

I shall conclude with summing up the principal heads of the argument I have handled, that the reader may have a clear view of them at once.

If Protestancy, as opposite to Popery, be the true religion, then it is that religion which was taught by Christ and his apostles; and, by consequence, Protestancy had a being before Popery. If so, then it follows that there happened, in some age or other, an

entire change from Protestancy to Popery, which was in the possession of the whole Church for many hundred years. But it is morally impossible that such a change should happen without opposition, nay, without causing great disturbances both in Church and state; and it is without example that such considerable events should neither be recorded in any histories written about the time when they happened, nor transmitted to posterity by writers of the following age; therefore, if Protestants cannot produce any such history, as it is certain they cannot, the pretended change from Protestancy to Popery is wholly groundless; and, by consequence, the religion of the Church of Rome is as ancient as Christianity, and her enemies are guilty of as many calumnies as they lay errors to her charge.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

Objection 1. The whole of this argument amounts to no more than a mere negative proof, and therefore is not conclusive.

Answer. That some negative arguments are as strong as any positive demonstration; though there be others that are frivolous and childish. As, for instance: it is as strong a proof as any positive demonstration, that Great Britain never was conquered by the Turks, because no history has ever made mention of it; and a man that should refuse to yield to such a proof, because it is but a negative one, would justly deserve to be cudgelled into better reason. But if any one should seriously maintain that neither William the Conqueror nor Henry VIII ever eat black puddings, because the fact is not recorded in any history, I believe he would not get the reputation of a profound wit by it. Now these two specimens may in some measure direct us to distinguish a good negative argument from a bad one; and I dare confidently say that the universal silence of historians proves my points as effectually as that Great Britain never was conquered by the Turks.

Objection 2. Praying in an unknown tongue, jubilees, and celibacy of priests were not practised in the ancient Church.

Answer. Though all this were true, the objection is not pertinent, because no article of faith is concerned in it.

This, and the four following objections, are taken out of a little anonymous book entitled "Friendly and Seasonable Advice to the Roman Catholics of England." But though the book be little in bulk, it contains the largest collection of barefaced lies and calumnies that ever were crowded together under one cover. The author, whoever he may be, has, perhaps, already accounted for it before the Great Tribunal; for it was written full thirty years ago. But if he be still alive, I cannot do less than return the favor of his friendly and seasonable advice, by advising him to repent while it is yet time, and atone for the wrong he has done to truth.

Objection 3. "The use of images," says this author, "can be derived no higher (as to its being decreed) than the second Council of Nice, anno 787."

Answer. The consubstantiality of the Son can be derived no higher (as to its being decreed) than the first Council of Nice, A.D. 325. And is this a good proof that it was not the faith of the Church in the first three centuries?

However, with the adviser's good leave, even the actual use of images was introduced into the Church long before the lawfulness of it was defined in the second Nicene Council. For how could it otherwise have occasioned the heresy of the Iconoclasts, or Image-breakers, which was condemned in that council? Though, in reality, it is nothing to the purpose to know when the actual use of them first became the public practice: for it is certain the Church never obliged the faithful to it as a thing essential to Christianity. On the contrary, it is a point of discipline only, which was not universally practised till idolatry was utterly extinguished in Christendom. But since that time the Church had reason to declare that "the images of Christ and his saints are to be retained: and that a due honor and veneration is to be given to them."[1] Nor do I see how anything of moment can be objected against it. But to a thinking spectator it cannot but appear somewhat odd that the

[1] Conc. Trid., Sess. 25.

Church of England should admit the pictures of Moses and Aaron into her churches, and banish those of Jesus Christ and his apostles.

Objection 4. " The administering the sacrament in one kind [says the friendly adviser, page 15] is no older than the Council of Constance."

Answer. If he means that the Church's faith before that council was, that " administering the sacrament in one kind is contrary to Christ's institution " (as he must mean, if he pretends to speak to the purpose), his assertion is flatly false. But if his meaning be that the Council of Constance ordered that the sacrament should from that time forward be administered to the laity in one kind only: though the fact be true, the objection is foreign to the matter under debate, if it be made evident that " receiving under one or both kinds is a point of discipline only."

Now, that it has always been regarded by the Church as such is an undeniable truth; because it is without dispute that in the primitive ages the sacrament was received sometimes in both kinds, sometimes in one. I shall not need to prove the former; and there are three undeniable instances of the latter from the practice of the primitive Church:

First, in the communion of infants, who were allowed to drink of the cup without receiving the consecrated Host.[1]

Secondly, in domestic communions; the faithful being permitted, by reason of the persecution in the second and third ages, to carry consecrated Hosts to their own houses for private communions in one kind only.[2]

Thirdly, in the manner frequently used of administering the sacrament to the sick.[3]

All which are unanswerable proofs that the manner of receiving the communion either in one or both kinds was regarded by the primitive Church as a point of discipline only; and, therefore, changeable according as the nature or exigency of circumstances

[1] Cyprian, Lib. de Lapsis.
[2] Tertullian, lib. 2, ad Uxoram, c. 5; Cyprian, Lib. de Lapsis.
[3] Eusebius, lib. 6, Hist., c. 44, p. 246.

should require. And it cannot be questioned but the primitive Church understood the meaning of Christ's precept and institution somewhat better than our late reformers; and would never have allowed of a communion under one kind only, upon any exigency whatsoever, if they had looked upon it as a mangling of the sacrament or a violation of Christ's ordinance.

And, therefore, what the friendly adviser says (page 10), that the taking away the cup from the laity is contrary to our Saviour's institution, is more than he can make out. But what he adds, namely, that "the very Council of Constance, which first enjoined communion in one kind, confesses that it is contrary to our Saviour's institution," is a calumny not to be matched but by many others of his own forging in the same book. For it is, in effect, to call the council an assembly either of atheists or of fools and madmen. For who but atheists and madmen are capable of making a decree like this, namely, "Notwithstanding that Christ has commanded all men to receive the sacrament in both kinds, it shall be given in one kind only to the people"? Surely a man must renounce his reason to judge that an assembly of Christian bishops and pastors, in their senses, should make such a mad and impious decree, in the face of the whole world.

As to the council's *non obstante*, etc., which is made the pretence for this calumny, the obvious and genuine meaning of it is this, namely, "Notwithstanding that our Saviour instituted the sacrament in both kinds, all are not commanded and bound to receive it in both kinds." Which is no less true than to say that "though God has instituted all sorts of meats for the use of mankind, yet all men are not commanded nor bound to eat of all sorts of meats." Nay, the Antiochians were by the apostles expressly forbid blood and things strangled. Both kinds, indeed, were consecrated by Christ, that both might be offered up in sacrifice, and be a perfect representation of his death by the mystical separation of his body and blood. But since neither laymen nor women are priests, as they have no power to consecrate, so they are not within the command of receiving both kinds.

Objection 5. "The doctrine of Purgatory [says the friendly adviser, page 12] was first built upon the credit of those fabulous dialogues attributed to Gregory the First."

Answer. This is very strange. For, according to the best of my skill in chronology, St. Augustine lived about two hundred years before St. Gregory; St. Cyril of Jerusalem is more ancient than St. Augustine; and Tertullian than both. Yet these, and many more of the same antiquity, teach the doctrine of Purgatory as fully and clearly as the Council of Trent. Let us hear Mr. Thorndike, an eminent Protestant divine. "The practice," says he, "of the Church interceding for them [the dead] at the celebration of the Eucharist, is so general and so ancient, that it cannot be thought to have come in upon imposture, but that the same aspersion will seem to take hold of the common Christianity." [1]

This is somewhat more charitable and mannerly than what the friendly adviser tells us, page 36: "That the doctrine of Purgatory has been decreed by the Church of Rome only to oblige people to give liberally, for themselves or their deceased friends, to those who sell their prayers so commonly that they occasioned that proverb, 'No penny, no paternoster.'"

What wonderful exploits will not such logic as this perform against Popery! But if it should be applied to baptisms and burials in the Church of England, I believe the parsons would not be very much pleased with it. For let me tell the friendly adviser, "No penny, no paternoster," is much truer in Protestant baptisms and burials than in Popish Masses for the dead. For I fear there are but few parsons so disinterested as to baptize or bury without their fee; whereas there are thousands of Masses said for the dead, without the least view or prospect of gain.

Objection 6. The adviser is likewise pleased to acquaint us (page 14) that auricular confession to a priest was never imposed as necessary till the Lateran Council, anno 1215, can. 21.

Answer. I must here return upon him with my former argument, namely, that no man of common sense will believe him, unless

[1] Thorndike, Just Weights and Measures, c. xvi, p. 106.

he can produce some history of the thirteenth century giving an account of the opposition which this new odious article met with, and the disturbances it occasioned in the Church. For it is as incredible that a new doctrine, so hateful and repugnant to human nature as that of auricular confession, after its having been believed unnecessary to salvation for near twelve hundred years, should be imposed upon the Church as necessary, and submitted to without opposition, noise, or trouble; this, I say, is as incredible as the most fabulous romance that ever was invented. Since, therefore, the canon of the Lateran Council relating to the point in question was effectually received by the Universal Church without any manner of opposition or trouble, it is a demonstration that it defined nothing but the ancient faith of the Church, nor imposed that as a necessary duty which had been believed unnecessary before.

The naked truth of the whole matter is this. The obligation or necessity of auricular confession had always been the faith of the Church. But there was a great neglect in the practice of it among Christians; some delaying it from year to year, and others putting it off to their very last sickness. To put a stop to this evil, the Lateran Council fixed the time, and by its twenty-first canon obliges all the faithful " to confess once a year, and receive the sacrament at Easter." And let any one judge whether this be imposing a new article of faith, as the adviser tells us. But it is his method to charge through thick and thin, and calumniate boldly, in hopes that at least some part of the dirt he throws at us may stick.

Objection 7. No man will at least deny that the article of transubstantiation was first coined in the Lateran Council.

Answer. I shall make bold both to deny it and prove it to be false. The friendly adviser (page 15) calls transubstantiation the discriminating doctrine of our Church, yet at the same time has the confidence to tell us that our own doctrine acknowledges that it was not held by the fathers: for which he quotes Valentia. Secondly, that our schoolmen confess that transubstantiation is not ancient: for which Suarez is quoted. And, thirdly, that Scotus and Duranus plainly deny it. It is very strange that four such eminent divines

and noted Papists should betray their own Church in a discriminating point of doctrine. But false quotations make as fine a show in the margin as true ones; and ignorant people, for whom alone the friendly adviser has calculated his treatise, will look upon him as a scholar of the first magnitude, and easily mistake bold forgeries for deep learning.

But to give a direct answer to the objection: the Lateran Council decreed nothing but the ancient faith of the Church. For there is a large difference between coining words and coining articles of faith. All men of learning know that the word "consubstantial" was first made use of, in the great Council of Nice, to express the divinity of Christ against the Arians. Was this, then, coining a new article of faith? No, it was only coining a new word to express the ancient faith and distinguish Catholics from Arians. In like manner, therefore, the word "transubstantiation" was first used, in the fourth Lateran Council, to express the ancient faith in relation to the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, as appears from the writings of the ancient fathers.

The word transubstantiation signifies a change of one substance into another; and in relation to the Eucharist it signifies a change of the bread into the body, and of the wine into the blood, of our Saviour Christ, made by the words of consecration. Now let us see whether the ancient fathers have not very plainly taught this doctrine.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. 4, Mystag.): "Since, therefore, Christ himself does thus affirm, and say of the bread, 'This is my body,' who from henceforward dares be so bold as to doubt of it? And since the same does assure us and say, 'This is my blood,' who, I say, can doubt of it, and say it is not his blood? In Cana of Galilee he once with his sole will turned water into wine, which much resembles blood. And does he not deserve to be credited that he changed wine into blood?"

St. Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. Catech., c. 37): "I do, therefore, now rightly believe that the bread, sanctified by the word of God, is changed into the body of God the Word. And here, like-

wise, the bread, as the Apostles say, is sanctified by the word of God and prayer. Not so, that by being eaten it becomes the body of the Word, but because it is suddenly changed into his body by this word, 'This is my body.' And this is effected by the virtue of benediction; by which the nature of those things which appear is transubstantiated into it."

St. Chrysostom (Hom. 83, in Matt.): "The things we propose are not done by human power; he that wrought these things at his Last Supper is the Author of what is done here. We hold but the place of ministers, but he that sanctifies and changes them is Christ himself."

St. Ambrose (de his. qui Mysteriis initiantur, c. 9): "If Christ by his words was able to make something of nothing, shall he not be thought able to change one thing into another?"

St. Jerome (Epist. ad Heliod.): "God forbid that I should speak detractingly of those men [bishops] who, succeeding the Apostles in their functions, do make the body of Christ with their sacred mouth."

These are a small part of the testimonies of the ancient fathers, both Greek and Latin, who have explained the doctrine of transubstantiation in as clear terms as any Roman Catholic divine can now do. It is, therefore, a calumny to say that it was imposed upon the Church by the Lateran Council, which was held above seven hundred years after the fathers quoted by me explained it in their writings. The word was new, indeed, but the doctrine is as ancient as the Church of Christ. Adamus Francisci (Marg. Theol., page 256) confesses that "transubstantiation entered early into the Church." And Antonius de Adamo, another Protestant writer, fairly owns "that he has not hithertc been able to know when this opinion of the real and bodily being of Christ in the sacrament did begin";[1] which, according to St. Augustine's maxim against the Donatists, is owning, in effect, that it had its beginning from Christ and his apostles.

But how could transubstantiation be coined into an article of

[1] Anat. Miss., p. 36.

faith in the Lateran Council, which was held A.D. 1215, when all the world knows that Berengarius was the author of a heresy against it in the eleventh century; and in that very century was condemned by no less than eleven national or provincial councils; the last whereof, held at Placentia, A.D. 1094, defines that "the bread and wine, when they are consecrated upon the altar, are truly and essentially changed into the body and blood of our Lord"?[1] And in the Roman Council, A.D. 1079, Berengarius was obliged to make his retraction in this form: "I, Berengarius, with my heart believe, and with my tongue confess, that the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar are, by the mystery of holy prayer and the words of our Redeemer, substantially changed into the true and proper and life-giving flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." Both which are convincing proofs that Dr. Cosin imposes upon his reader, in his "History of Transubstantiation," when he tells us (page 159) that "it was invented about the middle of the twelfth century, and confirmed by no ecclesiastical or papal decree before the year 1215," unless he means the word instead of the thing signified by it, which is trifling instead of proving.

To return once more to our friendly adviser, I shall now take under consideration his wonderful contrivance to bring in Popery in the dark; so that, if we believe him, it groped its way into the Universal Church without being perceived or opposed by anybody. Now, here lies the usefulness and ingenuity of the contrivance. Popery was certainly in possession of the universal visible Church for many hundred years before the reformation. The fact is so unquestionable, that impudence itself cannot deny it. For if it could, the adviser would have been the readiest man to do it.

But the knot of the difficulty is to give some rational account how it first got into possession. For if it were allowed that Popery had possession of the Church from the very beginning of Christianity, the reformed churches would not have a word to say for themselves. Or if it were owned that it came in barefaced, while all men's eyes were open to observe it, Papists would ask a thousand

[1] Tom. 10, Conc. Lat., p. 502.

troublesome questions about it. As: by whom, how, where, and when it was brought in? Whether no Protestant princes or bishops had zeal enough to oppose it? Or no Protestant councils were called to condemn it? And the like. And unless these questions were answered categorically, and the answers proved from authentic history, the matter would look but very scurvily in the judgment of all wise men.

Wherefore, to avoid splitting upon either of these rocks, observe the ingenuity of our friendly adviser. For he has ordered matters so cunningly that (unless we will question his veracity) we must believe that Protestancy was thrust out, and Popery let in, and the faith of the Church turned topsy-turvy, without opposition, noise, or trouble, or scarce anybody's being sensible of it. And to render the matter evident even to a demonstration, he tells us that the whole business was transacted in the dark, and while the world was in a profound sleep; for which he quotes this clear text of Scripture: "the tares were sowed while men slept";[1] so that we can suppose no less than that some strong soporiferous draught was given to all the bishops, doctors, and pastors of the Church, which laid them all so fast asleep, threw whole Christendom into so deep a lethargy, and, in a word, produced such a universal ignorance and stupidity among all degrees of men, that they either could not distinguish black from white, or, if they could, were unable to exert themselves in any manner to oppose the absurd and monstrous doctrines that were imposed upon them. Nay, and the virtue of this powerful enchantment lasted from the year 900 till a few years before the reformation: all which time an Egyptian darkness was spread over the whole face of the earth! And it was in the time of this universal ignorance and darkness that the Pope and his agents played all their pranks; established Popery with the greatest ease imaginable; and cut out work for the blessed reformation that followed. And thus the argument contained in the preceding sections is answered with a wet finger.

But, truly, there is scarce a fable in Ovid to be compared with

[1] Matt. xiii. 25.

this wonderful metamorphosis of the Church. That of Ulysses and his companions changed into hogs comes the nearest to it. And I think the friendly adviser has committed an oversight in not making use of this authentic piece to illustrate and adorn his ingenious system. For, truly, "Ovidius, lib. 14, Metamorphoses," would have made as beautiful a figure in the margin as the greatest part of the authors he has quoted.

However, to be somewhat more serious than the matter really deserves, I shall give a summary of it in his own words. "It cannot be denied," says he, "that from the time of the decay of the western empire, and the irruption of the Goths and Vandals into Europe, there began to be a great decay of learning, and barbarism crept in by degrees. And, at length, this ignorance became so universal, that the study of the liberal arts was generally laid aside. Yea, such gross folly possessed the world, that Christians believed more absurd things than Pagans gave credit to. And that age, which bred many of these errors, is commonly called the obscure age."

(Here he quotes Baronius, anno 900: so that this is the epoch from which the time of universal darkness is to be dated.) He continues:

"This age was wholly without persons eminent for wit or learning; the very inferior priests not being able to translate an epistle into Latin: which Egyptian darkness continued in all the western world till a few years before the reformation."

I confess, six hundred years of Egyptian darkness was a fair time for the Popes to play all their tricks of legerdemain, and juggle all mankind out of their senses. It is very strange, however, that in all this time there should not be one single man of the learning and zeal of Martin Luther to prevent so great a mischief.

"This gross stupidity," says the adviser, "must needs make the world apt and easy to be abused with the most absurd and monstrous doctrines: for ignorance is the mother of errors. This made way for the politic guides of Rome to impose such opinions on the Church as might best serve for their own ends. These tares were sowed while men slept: Matt. xiii. 25. And there were many

circumstances concurring in those unlucky ages, which contributed to the furthering of the Roman designs: the withdrawing of the emperors into the east, and the first decay of the western empire; then the destruction of the eastern, and the desolation of the famous oriental churches, by the spreading inundation of the Turks and Saracens. So that the Pope had neither emperor nor patriarch for a long time to oppose him; the miseries of all Christendom giving him opportunity to make himself sole governor of these parts of the world." (Section 3, pages 46, etc.)

This, I think, is nonsense enough for one time. But from the words of our friendly adviser, one would be apt to surmise that from the loss of Constantinople till the reformation the Popes had either massacred or deposed all the Christian princes and bishops in the West. For what else can the poor man mean by his saying that " the Pope made himself sole governor of these parts of the world "? Which, whether to be meant of his temporal or spiritual power, is equally absurd. And as to what he says, that " the Pope for a long time had neither emperor nor patriarch to oppose him," it is notoriously known that since the reign of Charlemagne, who was crowned emperor in the eighth century, the West has never been without Christian emperors, nor the East without its patriarchs, even since the Turks became masters of Constantinople. And, therefore, the adviser either wrote contrary to his own knowledge, or showed himself very ignorant of history.

To say nothing of his blunder in chronology concerning the first decay of the Western Empire, which happened several hundred years before the age of pretended darkness, let us briefly examine the system itself, and see whether there be anything either like truth or probability in it. He tells us, then, that the dark times began from the year 900, and that this age, namely, the tenth, " bred many of the Popish errors." But how does this agree with the Book of Homilies, which says positively that before the reformation " whole Christendom had been drowned in abominable idolatry for the space of eight hundred years and more "? For, by good computation, this brings Popery two whole centuries (and as much more

as you please) higher than the time unluckily pitched upon by the adviser. Nay, the Homilist assures us that the abominable idolatry he speaks of (which in Protestant language expresses very pathetically the whole body of Papistical doctrine) was spread over whole Christendom even sometime before the eighth century. So that, to the great disappointment of all the Popes of the tenth and following centuries, there was nothing for them to do in all that tedious time of Egyptian darkness in which our friendly adviser, out of his abundance of charity, has cut out so much good employment to keep them out of idleness. For, if we give credit to the Homilist, whose authority will probably carry it, their market was forestalled, and the whole business completed above two hundred years before they could come into play.

I shall, therefore, leave the adviser to fight it out as well as he can with the Book of Homilies. But he has a more formidable enemy to deal with—I mean a whole multitude of authentic writers bearing testimony that Popery was established in England full three hundred years before the tenth century. Venerable Bede, whose learning and veracity were never called in question, and who lived in the very next age after England had received the Christian faith, is one of the writers I speak of. So that, whoever desires to be satisfied of the truth of the fact I insist upon, needs but read his Ecclesiastical History of England, in the third tome of his works, and he will find that the religion called Popery was planted in this island by St. Austin and his companions, with a full account of its growth and establishment in the seventh century.

Besides, it is a known truth that the reformation made the first change of religion in England after its conversion. The consequence whereof is, that as England knew no other religion than Popery immediately before the reformation, so it received that very religion from St. Austin. And this saint, who confirmed the doctrine he preached by unquestionable miracles (which are related by holy Bede), taught no other than the faith of the universal Christian Church at that time. Which is a full demonstration that Popery was not beholden to the adviser's Egyptian darkness for its

establishment in the world; since that darkness came at least three hundred years too late.

But, thirdly, the adviser has no less a man than Martin Luther himself, with the whole college of reforming apostles, against him. For in the beginning of the reformation their usual language was, "What do we care for the fathers?" And Luther was above all remarkable for it. "I care not a rush," says he, "if a thousand Augustines or a thousand Cyprians stood against me" (Tom. 2, fol. 344). "Neither do I concern myself what Ambrose, Augustine, or councils say. I know their opinions so well that I have declared against them" (fol. 345). He speaks with the same contempt of St. Jerome. Whence it is evident that he looked upon all these fathers as teachers of Papistical doctrine, and enemies to the reformation.

What pity is it that the friendly adviser did not come time enough into the world to tell Martin Luther that his rejecting the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries would spoil the most ingenious system that ever was invented to make Popery pass for a novelty brought into the Church in dark ages far distant from the time of those fathers! For if so great a man as Luther stuck not to confess that Popery was taught by the most eminent saints and doctors in the very brightest and most learned ages of the Church, who will, after that, believe the adviser's tale of a tub, that it came sneaking in many hundred years after, only by the means of a universal ignorance and Egyptian darkness? And therefore the learned Mr. Napier, of whom I have already spoken, is to be highly commended for his sincerity in owning that Popery reigned universally in the very beginning of the fourth century: for this is speaking like a true disciple of the principal apostle of the reformation.

But though there were none of these facts to disprove the adviser's system, it would be fully confuted by the very improbability, nay, moral impossibility, of the principal supposition whereon it is grounded, namely, that a universal ignorance and stupidity, which he calls an "Egyptian darkness," reigned in the

world for the space of near six hundred years; that in all this time there were no persons eminent either for wit or learning; and that this gave the politic guides of Rome full opportunity to impose such opinions on the Church as might best serve their own ends, and made the world apt and easy to be abused with the most absurd and monstrous doctrines.

This is the adviser's supposition to support his system, expressed in his own words; which, though malicious in the highest degree, yet at the same time is so very extravagant that it moves my pity rather than anger. For we have here whole Christendom fairly divided into two classes of men, commonly known by the honorable titles of knaves and fools. The Popes, with their ministers and agents, according to this charitable supposition, were all knaves, void of religion, honor, and conscience; and the rest of Christendom, both laity and clergy, were all fools and blockheads, led by the nose, and abused with the most absurd and monstrous doctrines. And all this lasted for the space of many hundred years.

A most stupendous imagination, and only fit for the learned inhabitants of Moorfields! It is true, indeed, some ages may produce more persons of a superior genius than others, and liberal arts and sciences may flourish more at one time than another, because most things have their ebbings and flowings in the sublunary world. But that ignorance and stupidity should become universal for many hundred years together, and the greatest part of mankind be turned into mules and asses, ready saddled and bridled to be ridden by the Popes just as they pleased, may pass, indeed, for a very dull poetical fiction, but never for a good theological argument against Popery.

What! Were there neither schools nor universities nor libraries in all the time of this pretended universal ignorance and Egyptian darkness? Did the Popes interdict all wit and learning under pain of excommunication? Or did parents, in compliance with His Holiness, renounce their natural concern for their children, and oblige them to spend their youth in idleness or vice? For all this, or something very like it, must be supposed, to give any color of probability to the adviser's system. All schools must have been suppressed, uni-

versities abolished, libraries destroyed, and wit and learning made state crimes against the Pope. Nay, and there must have been a universal reform made among the bishops and pastors of the Church, by a positive law that none but dunces and blockheads should be duly qualified for holy orders! And even this would not have fully answered the politic ends of Rome, unless we further suppose that all the princes of Europe had their eyes put out and their arms tied to render them incapable of seeing or opposing the absurd and monstrous doctrines wherewith they were abused by the politic guides of Rome.

How miserably low must the credit of a cause be sunk when it stands in need of such nonsense to support it! I confess, unless I had quoted the adviser's own words, it might have been reasonably suspected that I had trumped up a ridiculous hypothesis of my own, barely for the pleasure to confute it. Let us but place it in a true light, and consider the extravagance and weakness of it.

Popery was certainly in possession of the Universal Church for many hundred years. Some account, then, was to be given how it came to be established. For, since it is a thing without example that any nation ever parted tamely with its ancient religion, if Popery was an intruder upon the ancient Church, how could it find means to establish itself without opposition while men were in their right senses? And if it met with opposition, this would have caused disturbances and schisms, and these disturbances would have been recorded by the writers of the times in which they happened. Now here the difficulty begins to pinch, because no history can be produced of any disturbance or schism in the Church, occasioned by any man's teaching the discriminating doctrines of Popery; whereas, on the contrary, there never was a doctrine opposite to any branch of Popery started in the Church, but it met with a vigorous resistance in its very birth, and caused disorders which are related by historians: as that of Berengarius, Wyclif, John Huss, the Waldenses, and others. In order, therefore, to make Popery (though pretended to be a doctrine opposite to the ancient faith) come in without noise or resistance, our friendly adviser has no other expedient to bring

about this wonderful event, than to assert boldly that Christendom was under a general infatuation for many hundred years together; and so make Popery steal its way into the Church, unperceived and unopposed, in the midst of a thick darkness of universal ignorance and stupidity.

But the thickest darkness cannot hide the extravagance of this ridiculous fable. There are numberless historical facts that give it the lie. As, first, the many learned universities that flourished in those very ages of pretended darkness; among which, that of Paris, founded by Charlemagne, and that of Oxford, founded by King Alfred, were most famous. Secondly, the great number of ecclesiastical writers, whereof Bellarmine ("de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis") reckons up between two and three hundred in those very ages; and many of these were as eminent both for holiness and learning as any of the ancient writers. Thirdly, besides innumerable provincial and national synods, there were about ten general councils held between the ninth and the sixteenth century; and some of them were more numerous than any that had been held before. Nor did they meet in cellars underground, like clippers and coiners, but in the face of the Universal Church, attentive to everything that was transacted in those august assemblies. Nay, and the histories of them are faithfully transmitted to us, without any mention of the least change made in the ancient faith of the Church. Fourthly, the long and warm disputes, between the emperors and the Popes, concerning the privilege of investiture, which lasted some ages, and show that the Popes were not arbitrary lords and masters, nor led all Christendom by the nose. And lastly (to omit many more historical facts for brevity's sake), the Greek schism, which began in the ninth century, and was not ended till the Council of Florence, A.D. 1437. During which time, if the Popes had made any false steps in point of doctrine, the sharp-sighted Greeks, who were continually upon the watch to lay hold of any advantage against the Latins, would undoubtedly have reproached them with it: since they even accused them of shaving their beards, eating hog's flesh, and many other trivial matters.

Now these are demonstrative proofs that Christendom was neither so stupidly ignorant as to be unable to discern absurd and monstrous innovations from the ancient doctrine, nor so sheepishly passive as to submit tamely to any yoke the Popes should lay upon them. Whence I conclude that since the adviser's system is a flat contradiction both to history and common sense, it can do no prejudice to the argument I have handled in the preceding sections; which, unless some better answer be given to it, is a moral demonstration that "no Christian Church, teaching a doctrine opposite to Popery, ever appeared in the world before it," and that, by consequence, the Church of Rome teaches no other than the ancient faith of the Church.

But some will say it is improbable that any man should attempt to reform the faith of a Church, unless he were sure that some considerable errors had crept into it. I answer that this, if it were true, would be a good apology for Arius, Socinius, and other such reformers. But St. Paul was of another opinion. For he tells us expressly "that there must be heresies, that they who are approved may be made manifest."[1] Let us, then, consider the character of the first and principal reformer of Popery, and judge from it whether the children of the reformation have any just reason to glory in such a father.

The person I speak of is Martin Luther, the first discoverer of the pretended errors of the Church of Rome. For, as to those that followed him, they had nothing to do but enter at the breach which he had made, and share with him at the plunder of their Mother Church.

I pretend not, however, to concern myself in any particular manner with the Church that takes its denomination from him, or to consider Luther any otherwise than as head of the reformation in general. For the only end I promise to myself is to show that a person of a scandalous character has not the true marks of a reformer of Christ's Church, unless the word reformer be taken as synonymous with that of heretic; and I hope thereby to convince

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 19.

the reader that the Church of Rome may be uncorrupt and free from errors, though Martin Luther thought fit to be of another opinion.

Let us now consider the character which a grave archbishop and primate of England has given of this great apostle of the reformation. "In the beginning of the reformation," says Tillotson,[1] "when Antichrist sat securely in the possession of his kingdom, Luther arose; a bold and rough man, but a fit wedge to cleave asunder so hard and knotty a block: and appeared stoutly against the gross errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, and for a long time stood alone."

I shall make but two short remarks upon the bishop's words. First, he dignifies his hero with the titles of "a bold and rough man, and a fit wedge to cleave a hard and knotty block." Surely these titles are not much becoming an apostolical man; and I fear the bishop will be thought to have had before his eyes the pattern of some famous gladiator, rather than a meek and humble preacher of the Gospel. Secondly, the bishop has here owned a fact which may serve, indeed, to set off the intrepidity of his bold and rough man, who, as he tells us, "for a long time stood alone," but the credit of the reformation must suffer by it. For it is but an odd argument to convince any man that Luther had the truth on his side, because the whole world was against him.

I imagine, indeed, the bishop did not fully reflect upon the consequences of this concession. For if Martin Luther for a long time stood alone, and had, by consequence, the whole Christian world against him (which agrees exactly with his own *primo solus eram*), it follows plainly that he had no ordinary mission from any man upon earth. Because it is a thing contrary to all practice, and even common sense, that a man shall be commissioned to teach and preach a doctrine opposite to that of the Church, or immediate superior, from whom he receives his commission. Does a king ever give commissions to his officers to levy forces against himself? Have judges their credentials to subvert the laws of the government under

[1] Sermons, p. 588.

which they serve? Or will any man, for example, say that Mr. Wh——on had, by virtue of his ordination, a power given him to teach a doctrine contrary to that of his Mother Church? Either, then, it was an irregularity in him to do so, or not. If not, why were his writings condemned? Why was he expelled the university? If so, then Martin Luther was guilty of a much greater irregularity in preaching a doctrine in which he had the whole Church against him, and from which he could not, by consequence, have a commission for so doing. For Luther " for a long time stood alone."

In effect, when Luther first set out in quality of reformer, the Roman Catholic Church was spread over all the principal kingdoms of Europe, which were then in perfect communion with the Bishop of Rome, and had been so from their conversion to Christianity, as I have already observed. They all acknowledged the Pope as Head of the Church, and professed no other religion than what goes now under the odious name of Popery. Mass was said in all the churches of Christendom. The real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the doctrine of transubstantiation, the number of seven sacraments (which are since reformed away into two), were the universal belief. Praying for the souls departed, imploring the intercession of saints, and paying due respect to their images and relics, were then practised in all places where Christianity was known. Nay, I defy any man to mark me out one single province, town, village, or even family in Christendom, where the Protestant religion, either as now established by law in Great Britain, or as it is modelled by any of the late reformed churches, was publicly professed and practised when Martin Luther made his first appearance. For Luther " for a long time stood alone."

Now, besides the irregularity of a man's setting up a new religion of his own head, and without commission to empower him to do it, is it rational to judge that all Christendom was then, and had continued for many hundred years, under a kind of lethargy, or infatuation, and that but one single man, a private Austin friar, should start up all on a sudden in his right senses? Were

there not at that time hundreds of bishops, doctors, and pastors in the world, as learned and zealous for the purity of the Christian faith as Martin Luther? It is, therefore, very strange that he should either be the only man clear-sighted enough to detect the gross errors of Popery, or, if others were equally convinced of them, that he alone should have had zeal enough to oppose them.

This argument has frequently been urged against the first broachers of heresies, who always pretended that the Church had fallen into errors; and it is but too plain that the reformation labors under this great prejudice, namely, that whereas the true Church has, and can have, no other than Christ himself, and his blessed apostles commissioned by him, for its founders, the reformation, on the contrary, has this resemblance with all known heresies that were ever broached, that it has for its author a single private person preaching and writing, not only without commission from any lawful superior, but even in direct opposition to all the Church authority that was then visibly extant upon earth. For Luther "for a long time stood alone."

The case, then, fairly and impartially stated, is this, namely, Whether this one single man, without commission or authority from any lawful superior, was more to be depended upon in the great cause of faith and religion, than the whole visible Church that was against him when he first took upon himself the title of reformer? I cannot but think that every impartial judge will decide it in the negative.

To set this matter in its clearest light, I shall put a case almost parallel to it. Suppose some private man in Great Britain should take upon him to run down the whole constitution, and tell the people that the King and Parliament have no legislative power; that the judges are a pack of fools and knaves, and understand nothing of the law; that no regard is to be had to the King's lieutenants, justices of the peace, or other subaltern officers;—suppose, I say, extravagances of this nature, tending manifestly to the disturbance and subversion of the government, should be talked or written by any private man: I ask whether it would be rational to believe

him, in opposition to the sense of the whole nation? No, surely. But, on the contrary, he would be either treated as a madman or prosecuted as a disturber of the public peace; which, in all likelihood, would have been the fate of Martin Luther, had he not found the secret to shelter himself under the favor and protection of his sovereign, the Duke of Saxony, by setting before him the sweet bait of filling his coffers with the revenues of the Church and the plunder of rich monasteries, which was everywhere the first-fruit of the reformation, as all the world knows.

But, to make now the application of the case supposed: When the reformation was first thought of, the Roman Catholic Church was the only established Church of all the principal kingdoms and states of Europe. This Church was governed by the Pope as head; each kingdom, by its primate; and each particular diocese, by its respective bishop and pastors under him; just as Great Britain is governed by King and council, lord-lieutenants, justices of peace, etc. The Scriptures, canons, and decrees of councils were the law according to which the Church was governed both in her faith and discipline. She had, then, prescription for what is now called Popery, of many hundred years, as is acknowledged by the most eminent Protestants. All the bishops, divines, and learned men of Europe and many other parts of the world were united in the same faith, and believed themselves to be in the bosom of the true Church. Martin Luther alone, a private Austin friar, starts up, and tells the world that this whole Church is tainted with many gross errors; that himself is the only true interpreter of Scriptures; that the canons and decrees of councils signify nothing; that the Pope is Antichrist, and all the bishops, doctors, and divines are no better than a parcel of blockheads and impostors. For this was the main scope of all his reforming writings. I speak modestly: for, according to his usual good manners, he calls them all "calves and asses." Nay, the very fathers of the Church, those great lights and ornaments of the Christian faith, were treated no better by him; and Dr. Tillotson had all the reason in the world to call him "a bold and rough man, and a fit wedge to cleave a knotty block."

But, to conclude the parallel, I have but this one question to ask: Whether it was more rational to believe this single man, in opposition to the concurring faith and authority of the Universal Church, than it would be now to believe a single factious fellow against the sense and judgment of the whole nation? For if this cannot be judged rational, as surely it cannot, then the doctrine of the reformation appears manifestly unsound in its very head and source; and time, which cannot change the nature of things, nor turn falsehood into truth, has not in the least bettered its cause.

I shall here take the freedom to demand a thing, wherein if any Protestant can but give me some tolerable satisfaction, I will not only give up this whole chapter relating to Luther, but likewise own that a reformer of the Church's faith and a heretic are not synonymous terms. I question not but every Protestant will grant that there have been heretics in the world; and I shall mention one, of whose just claim to that title no true Protestant can doubt. I mean Arius, who denied the consubstantiality of the Son; and though he pretended to have plain Scripture for his doctrine (as these words of Christ, "my Father is greater than I"), this hindered not his being condemned for a heretic by the great Council of Nice. And, indeed, he had all the marks of one: as broaching a doctrine contrary to the faith of the whole visible Church of Christ in being; preaching without a commission from her; appealing from her authority to the dead letter of Scriptures, and making his own private judgment the sole interpreter of it; in a word, an invincible obstinacy even after sentence juridically pronounced against him, first by his immediate superior, and afterward by the supreme tribunal of the Church. These are the usual marks of what we call an arch-heretic, and they were undoubtedly very notorious in Arius.

Now, the thing I demand is precisely this, namely, some satisfactory reason why Arius was a heretic any more than Luther; or (which amounts to the same) that some proper and distinguishing mark of a heretic may be found to belong to Arius which cannot be appropriated to Martin Luther. Whoever can perform this will

do the reformation a signal piece of service. But if it cannot be done (and I fear the task will prove somewhat hard), then it follows that the respective churches founded by Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, etc., are all heretical churches like that of the Arians, and no part of the Church of Christ.

If any one be so weak as to say that the great difference between Arius and Luther is that Arius opposed the doctrine of the Church when she was pure, but that Luther rose up against her when she was "corrupt" in her doctrine: I shall only answer him that this is begging the question instead of proving; and the followers of Arius will say just the same in defence of their master, and plain Scripture will be pretended for it. So that if nothing can be produced to distinguish Luther's behavior toward his Mother Church from that of Arius; if they be found to sympathize in all the proper and characteristic marks of what we commonly mean by a true and stanch heretic: we cannot judge otherwise than that either both must be absolved or both condemned.

However, if Martin Luther may be allowed to be a judge in his own cause, he has not been wanting to himself in pronouncing sentence in favor of his new doctrine, though not altogether with the modesty of an evangelical preacher. His own words shall be the best proof of what I say. "I am certain," says he, "I have my doctrine from Heaven; it shall stand, and the Pope shall fall, in spite of all the gates of hell, and the powers of the air, the earth, and sea."[1]

I should be glad to know whether that part of his doctrine was from Heaven which he learned in the colloquy he had with the devil, related at large by himself.

Again: "I was the first to whom God vouchsafed to reveal the things which have been preached to you; and certain I am, that you have the pure word of God."[2]

(N. B. That if Martin Luther was the first to whom God vouchsafed to reveal the things which he preached, it follows that

[1] Tom. 2, fol. 333, 1, against Henry VIII of England.
[2] Tom. 7, fol. 27, 4.

the apostles never knew nor preached his doctrine; which makes me fear his works will never pass for canonical Scripture, or the revealed Word of God, though we have his own word for it. But what follows is a very extraordinary piece, and will certainly very much edify the reader.)

"I, Martin Luther, by the grace of God, ecclesiastes in Wittenberg, to the Popish bishops, grace and peace: This title I now assume with the utmost contempt of you and Satan, that you may not plead ignorance. And should I style myself an evangelist by the grace of God, I could sooner prove my claim to this title than you to that of bishop. For I am certain that Christ himself calls me so, and looks upon me as an ecclesiastes. He is the master of my doctrine. Neither doubt I, but in the great day of accounts he will be my witness that this doctrine is not mine, but the doctrine of God, of the Spirit of the Lord, and of the pure and sincere Gospel. So that should you kill me, ye bloodsuckers, yet you will never extinguish either me, or my name, or my doctrine, unless Christ be not living. Since now I am certain that I teach the word of God, it is not fit I should want a title for the recommending of this word, and work of the ministry, to which I am called by God; which I have not received of men, nor by men, but by the gift of God, and revelation of Jesus Christ. And now I declare beforehand, that for the time to come I will not honor you so far as to condescend to submit myself or my doctrine to your judgment, or to that of an angel from heaven."[1]

Here we have a piece of insolence and arrogance never to be paralleled—nay, even to a degree of frenzy and madness. We see here a miserable wretch flying in the face of superiors, trampling upon authority, and even assuming to himself that infallibility which he would not allow to the Church of Christ. But God, who resists the proud, confounded his arrogance by permitting him to fall not only into the most impious absurdities in point of doctrine, as will appear hereafter, but even scandalous irregularities in practice. For, though it cost him nothing to mimic the style of a Paul, he

[1] Tom. 2, fol. 305,

RAPTURE OF ST. PAUL

(2 Corinthians xii)

FROM THE PAINTING BY DOMENICHINO

could never attain the strength of a Paul to resist the buffets of Satan. His marriage, doubly sacrilegious by engaging a person consecrated to God in the same crime, betrayed a weakness of so scandalous a nature as not only gave great offence to his friend Melanchthon (lib. 4, Epist. 24) and the sober part of his new reformed Church, but will be an everlasting mark of dishonor to the reformation, and a convincing proof that the hand of God had no part in it. For if the tree may be known by its fruit, and the man by his works, we may justly conclude that the world, the flesh, and the devil were far more prevalent in this pretended reformer than the Spirit of God.

Was it by divine inspiration that he lived at open defiance of all ecclesiastical authority? Was it by divine inspiration that he broke vows, threw off his religious habit, and with it all the duties of a religious state, to which he had consecrated himself for life? Finally, was it by the impulse of the Holy Ghost that he indulged himself in wantonness, when he should have been singing the divine office, as the rule of his order required of him? I know not whether these be proper marks of an apostolical spirit and a man called by Christ to the work of the ministry; but I am sure they are marks of a very fresh date, and wholly unknown to antiquity. For we read, indeed, of the apostles, who were married before their vocation to the apostleship, that they left their wives to follow Christ; and many other apostolical men have done the same after their example. But it is to Luther's reformation alone we owe those excellent patterns of persons breaking through the most sacred engagements of holy orders and religious vows to become fathers of children not altogether in a spiritual way, and very different from that of the Apostle of the Gentiles, who begot the Corinthians, and many other spiritual children in Jesus Christ, through the Gospel.[1]

It seems, however, that Martin Luther found it, if not more edifying, at least more comfortable to join the state of matrimony with his apostolical labors, and call Kate Bora to his assistance in the work of the ministry. For I question not but her good example

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 15.

brought in a plentiful harvest of female converts; and as to Luther's practice, it was but a natural consequence to his doctrine. The one prepared the way for the other. For to what end did he preach down celibacy and vows of chastity, if he had intended to keep them? He was not ignorant that marriage of priests was forbidden by the established laws of the Church, and breaking vows by the laws of God; but flesh and blood prevailed, and it was from these he had got the confidence to boast of. The charms of liberty and a female companion gave him wonderful light into matters of religion, and made him discover errors unseen before. Without these extraordinary helps to quicken his zeal and spur him on to undertake the glorious work of the reformation, he might have continued a private monk till death, and as utter a stranger to all Popish "errors" as when he first made his solemn vows. It is certain, however, that his preaching, as he did, without a mission from any lawful superior is an essential flaw in everything he taught contrary to the doctrine of his Mother Church, and entitles him to no better character than that of a hardened apostate and one abandoned by God to be a scourge to his Church and the instrument of his secret but just judgment on those whom he seduced.

When God raises men in an extraordinary manner, as he did the prophets and apostles, he never fails to qualify them accordingly; and all those who had their mission immediately from him were manifestly guided by his Spirit. The virtues that shone in their actions, and the miracles they wrought, were their credentials, and it was impossible to see their works without being convinced of the truth of their words.

This may likewise be said of the great reformers of manners whom God has raised from time to time to repair the gradual decay of Christian morality: as St. Benedict, St. Bernard, St. Dominic, St. Francis, St. Ignatius, and other holy founders of religious orders. They were all powerful in works and words. They prepared themselves for the great work of the conversion of sinners by retirement, prayer, fasting, mortification of their senses, and an entire contempt of the world. And what is very remarkable in the lives of

these great men, they never made a step but with obedience and submission to their lawful superior. Meekness and humility, two virtues peculiarly recommended by Christ, were the most distinguishing parts of their character; and even their greatest enemies could never reproach them with any one irregular practice.

But, alas! how far is Martin Luther, the founder of the reformation, from coming up to the least part of this noble character! He pretends to have had his mission immediately from God. But must we take his own bare words for it? Where are his credentials? What miracles has he wrought? What extraordinary virtues can he show to convince us of the truth of what he says? I have already discovered some considerable flaws both in his principles and practice, which are no marks of an extraordinary call. However, allowing these to be but after slips of human frailty, if he was really called to the ministry of the Gospel immediately by God himself, the least we can suppose is that God infused into him the proper previous dispositions to fit him for so high a station, and, above all, inspired him with a most ardent love of him; this being a quality inseparable from a true zeal for the service of his holy Church. But to prevent our falling into this mistaken good opinion of him, Luther himself has taken care to inform us of the true state of his soul the year before he set up his separate communion. "Out of thy own mouth I judge thee, thou wicked servant." [1]

For in the preface to his first tome (page 6) he tells us how his soul was at that time affected toward God. "I was mighty desirous," says he, "to understand Paul in his Epistle to the Romans: but was hitherto deterred, not by any faint-heartedness, but by one single expression in the first chapter, namely, 'therein is the righteousness of God revealed.' For I hated that word, 'the righteousness of God': because I had been taught to understand it of that formal and active righteousness by which God is righteous and punishes sinners and the unrighteous. Now knowing myself, though I lived a monk of an irreproachable life, to be in the sight of God a sinner, and a most unquiet conscience, nor having any

[1] Luke xix. 22.

hopes to appease him with my own satisfaction, I did not love, nay, I hated this righteous God who punishes sinners; and with heavy muttering, if not with silent blasphemy, I was angry with God, and said, as if it were not enough for miserable sinners, who are lost to all eternity by original sin, to suffer all manner of calamity by the law of the decalogue, unless God by the Gospel adds sorrow to sorrow, and even by the Gospel threatens us with his righteousness and anger. Thus did I rage with a fretted and disordered conscience."

Blessed God! What a disposition is here to prepare a man for the ministry of the Gospel, the preaching of the pure Word of God, and the reformation of Christ's Church! What strange marks are these of an extraordinary call! A man raging with a fretted and disordered conscience; angry with God, murmuring against him, nay, hating and silently blaspheming his justice for punishing sinners! How can we represent the very damned souls in hell in blacker colors? For the very worst we can say of them is that they hate, curse, and blaspheme God's justice for punishing their past crimes. Because to hate any of God's attributes is to hate God himself; and the very thought of hating God carries horror with it.

How happy is the Church of Rome in having such an accuser! The infamy of his evidence is her full justification, and a convincing proof that the Spirit of God had no part in a work wherein Martin Luther was a principal actor. If a man who by his own confession hated and blasphemed God is to be depended on in the great concern of religion, and that upon the credit of his having been divinely inspired and called in an extraordinary manner, then let the Church of Rome be thought guilty of the errors whereof he has accused her.

But we have hitherto seen but one part of his true picture. He has been so just to posterity as to leave it drawn at full length in his own writings. Let us, then, take a full view of him, and, when we have considered him attentively, judge whether he bears the least resemblance to a man divinely inspired and commissioned immediately by Christ to reform his Church.

The passages I have made use of are all taken out of his works printed at Wittenberg, the first tome in 1582, the second 1562, the third 1583, the fourth 1574, the fifth 1554, the sixth 1580, the seventh 1558. And all these have, at the beginning, Martin Luther and his protector, the Duke of Saxony, represented at their prayers before a crucifix. If any Protestant can convict me of unfair dealing in my quotations, I shall be ready to make any public reparation that shall be demanded of me.

"If God foresaw," says he, "that Judas would be a traitor, Judas of necessity became a traitor. Neither was it in the power of Judas nor of any other creature to do otherwise, or to change his will." [1]

"This is the highest degree of faith, to believe God to be just, though by his own will he lays us under a necessity of being damned; and in such a manner, too, as if he took delight in tormenting the miserable." [2]

"'Thou shalt not covet,' is a commandment which proves us all to be sinners; since it is not in any man's power not to covet. And the same is the drift of all the commandments, for they are all equally impossible to us." [3]

Here God, the Father of mercies, is represented as a merciless and arbitrary tyrant, commanding things which we have it not in our power to perform, and punishing the non-performance with eternal torments.

"Free-will after sin is no more than an empty name: and when it does its best, sins mortally." [4]

"Man's will is in the nature of a horse. If God sits upon it, it tends and goes as God would have it go. If the devil rides it, it tends and goes as the devil would have it. Nor can it choose which of the riders it will run to or seek. But the riders themselves strive who shall gain and possess it." [5]

This doctrine paves the way to, and is an apology for, any wick-

[1] De Ser. Arb., tom. 2, fol. 460, 3.
[2] *Ibid.* fol. 434, 1.
[3] De Lib. Chris., tom. 4, 2.
[4] Adversus Execrab. Anti. Bullam, tom. 2, fol. 3, 2.
[5] De Ser. Arb., tom. 2, fol. 434, 2.

edness whatsoever. Because necessity has no law. But what follows makes large amends for it in delivering us from eternal damnation for any sins but infidelity. So that a man may be the most profligate sinner upon earth, and yet be in the state of salvation, if he does but believe.

"A person," says he, "that is baptized, cannot, though he would, lose his salvation by any sins how grievous soever, unless he refuses to believe. For no sins can damn him but unbelief alone." [1]

"The contrition with which a man reflects upon his past years in the bitterness of his soul, by considering the grievousness, the damage and baseness, the multitude of his sins, and then the loss of eternal happiness, and the incurring eternal damnation, makes him a hypocrite, and even the greater sinner." [2]

"The Papists teach that faith in Christ justifies, indeed, but that God's commandments are likewise to be kept. Now this is directly to deny Christ, and abolish faith." [3]

A man must be very wicked, indeed, to turn Papist, since they teach that God's commandments are to be kept! What follows is admirable.

"Let this be your rule: where the Scriptures command the doing a good work, understand it in this sense, that it forbids thee to do a good work, because thou canst not do it." [4]

This certainly is a most golden rule, to interpret the Scriptures backward; not to do what they command, and to do what they forbid! Martin Luther was, without all dispute, the first to whom this rule was revealed. And I presume he had it in view when, contrary to the express word of God, he denied all legislative power in men.

"Neither Pope, nor bishop, nor any man living, has a right to impose one syllable upon any Christian, unless he gives his consent. And whatsoever is done to the contrary is by the spirit of tyranny." [5]

"The power of making laws belongs to God alone." [6]

[1] Capt. Bab., tom. 2, fol. 74, 1.
[2] Serm. de Pœnit., tom. 1, fol. 50, 2.
[3] Ep. ad Gal., tom. 5, fol. 311, 2.
[4] *Ibid.* tom. 3, fol. 171, 2.
[5] Capt. Bab., tom. 2, fol. 76, 2.
[6] Contra Reg. Ang., tom. 2, fol. 346, 1.

This is reforming both Church and state with a vengeance, by purging the one as well as the other of all its laws, which, as to discipline in the Church, and order of government in the state, were all made by men, who, according to Luther's gospel, have no legislative power. But these, perhaps, were all involuntary mistakes, which (though it derogates very much from the credit of his being inspired) are no reflection upon his sincerity. But the following piece will show how great a lover he was of truth, when he was convinced of it, and what pains he took to find it.

"If Carlostadius, or any man else, could, five years ago, have convinced me that in the sacrament there is nothing but bread and wine, he had wonderfully obliged me: for with great anxiety did I examine this point, and labor with all my force to get clear of the difficulty. [Mark well the reason why he took so much pains.] Because by this means I know very well I should terribly incommode the Papacy. But I find I am catched without hope of escaping. For the text of the Gospel is so clear and strong, that it will not easily admit of a misconstruction." [1]

Poor man! What a hardship it was upon him that he should be forced to own the truth, when he had so good an inclination to deny it! But why did he not spell the Gospel backward, according to his own rule, and declare that these words of Christ, "This is my body," "This is my blood," signify the same as "This is not my body," "This is not my blood"? For this would have done his business with the greatest ease imaginable.

But I assure the reader he will find him more resolute in the following piece. For there, to be revenged of the Pope, he stoutly gives himself the lie, and repents of having come too near the truth in his former writings.

"Whereas I said that some of John Huss's articles were evangelical; this I retract. And now I say not that some, but all John Huss's articles were condemned at Constance by Antichrist and his apostles in that synagogue of Satan. And I tell thee plainly to thy face, most holy Vicar of God, that all the condemned proposi-

[1] Epis. ad Amicos Argent., tom. 7, fol. 502, 1.

tions of John Huss are evangelical and Christian, and that all thine are wholly impious and diabolical. Therefore, as to the condemned articles of John Huss, I maintain them all, and am ready, by the grace of God, to defend them." [1]

(N. B. That one of John Huss's evangelical articles, which he had learned of his master Wyclif, was this, namely: " That the committing a mortal sin made kings and bishops forfeit their power and character." Which doctrine introduces anarchy both into Church and state.)

I am sorry I have been forced to foul my paper with so much ribaldry. But I thought it necessary, in order to convince the reader of two things: first, that I have not wronged the person who gave birth to the reformation in anything I have said of him. And, secondly, that a person so violent and brutal in his temper, on the one hand, and, on the other, guilty of such scandalous, nay, even impious and blasphemous doctrine, cannot be looked upon as an inspired man, or raised immediately by God to reform his Church. Those whom Almighty God has almost in all ages chosen as peculiar instruments of his mercy, have ever appeared in the world not only with a clear character, but with the most evident marks of the Divine Spirit residing in their hearts and speaking by their mouths. A meek and humble zeal appeared in all their works, and every word they spoke had truth stamped upon it. Luther, therefore, was not of this heavenly race; nor could the mission of him who had the character of the beast impressed on every feature be immediately from God; and since it is likewise manifest that he had no ordinary mission from any man upon earth, the consequence is that whatever he preached in opposition to his Mother Church was a doctrine either borrowed from old condemned heretics, or hammered out in his own brain. And so we can regard him no otherwise than as an instrument of divine justice, and one of those great scourges which God makes use of from time to time, and permits to prosper in their wickedness, both to try and purify the faith of the elect, and to accomplish his just judgments on reprobate sinners.

[1] Adversus Execrab. Anti. Bullam, tom. 2, fol. 109, 1.

If any one asks me, Whether all the extravagant and scandalous opinions of Luther or other reformers are to be changed upon any particular reformed Church, or the whole reformation?—I answer to the first, that neither the Lutheran, nor any other particular reformed Church, can justly be charged with any proposition which they disavow and condemn; as I presume they all do the grosser part of the errors scattered up and down in their writings. As, for instance, if a Lutheran, or preacher of any sect, should now presume to maintain in any government whatsoever, "that the power of making laws belongs to God alone," I believe a collar of hemp would soon put a stop to such seditious doctrine. Or if a preacher should now tell the British wives that they may lawfully have "ten or more husbands living at once"; or the young man, "that it is impossible for him to live without a maid"—I fancy such a preacher, though he should quote Paul for his author, as Luther did, would not be long without having his canonical gown turned over his head.

I answer to the second, that even the reformation in general cannot justly be charged with the scandalous doctrine of any particular reformer, provided that all the reformed churches disown this principle, namely: "That the rule of faith is Scripture as interpreted by a man of sound judgment." For if they stand to that principle, they are all equally accountable for everything taught by their reformers, even when they contradict one another: because they surely look upon them as men who were not only of sound judgment, but great learning. All opinions, therefore, though ever so extravagant or impious, if supported by the forementioned principle, are properly the doctrine of the reformation, unless that principle be utterly disowned. Because whatever follows clearly from an avowed principle of a party, may justly be charged upon the whole party; as whatever follows clearly from any principle maintained by the Church of Rome may properly be called her doctrine. But if the reformed churches disown that principle, and instead of it make the revealed word of God, as interpreted by the Church, the rule of their faith, there will be no danger of their accounting for the scandalous doctrine either of Martin

Luther or his fellow-reformers: but then the reformation loses its best support.

But I shall waive all further remarks relating to this matter, as being foreign to my present purpose. For I am wholly upon the defence of my own Church, and have had no other view, in exposing the irregular conduct and extravagant principles of Martin Luther, than to invalidate the testimony of a man who has appeared as a principal evidence against the Church whose cause I espouse. Luther was the first informer against her, "and for a long time stood alone." Those who followed him only built upon the foundation which he had laid; though they could not agree with their architect about the manner of the superstructure, but, like the builders of Babel, were divided in their tongues.

If, therefore, I have clearly showed that this great informer against the Church of Rome is not *restus in curia*, that he is no legal evidence, but a scandal to his cause, I hope it will be of some use to remove the general prepossession against the doctrine of that Church, and serve as a collateral proof to convince impartial readers that the errors charged upon the Church of Rome are all imaginary and fictitious; and then the positive proofs of her infallibility, being considered without prejudice, will lose nothing of their weight: as they will most certainly do upon persons strongly prejudiced and prepossessed against it.

I shall here add the copy of a printed paper I casually met with. For, as we have now seen by what hands the first foundation of the reformation in general was laid, so will this piece inform us who were the three principal authors of the particular reformation in Great Britain, and what motives induced them to it. The piece I mean is the declaration of the Duchess of York occasioned by her conversion to the Roman Catholic faith, and published in the year 1670.

It is so reasonable to expect that a person always bred up in the Church of England, and as well instructed in the doctrine of it as the best divines and her capacity could make her, should be liable to many censures for leaving that, and making herself a member of the Roman Catholic Church,

to which, I confess, I was one of the greatest enemies it ever had; that I choose rather to endeavor to satisfy my friends by reading this paper, than to have the trouble to answer all the questions that may daily be asked me. And first, I do profess, in the presence of Almighty God, that no person, man or woman, directly or indirectly, ever said anything to me (since I came into England) or used the least endeavor to make me change my religion. It is a blessing I wholly owe to Almighty God, and I hope the hearing of a prayer I daily made him ever since I was in France and Flanders, where, seeing much of the devotion of the Catholics (though I had very little myself), I made it my continual request to Almighty God that if I were not, I might, before I died, be in the true religion. I did not in the least doubt but that I was so: and never had any manner of scruple till November last: when, reading a book called "The History of the Reformation," by Dr. Heylin; which I had heard very much commended, and had been told, if ever I had any doubt in my religion, that would settle me; instead of which, I found it the description of the most horrid sacrileges in the world: and could find no reason why we left the Church, but for three of the most abominable ones that were ever heard of amongst Christians.

First, Henry VIII renounces the Pope's authority, because he would not give him leave to part with his wife, and marry another, in her lifetime.

Secondly, Edward VI was a child, and governed by his uncle, who made his estate out of Church lands.

And then Queen Elizabeth, who, being no lawful heiress to the crown, could have no way to keep it but by renouncing a Church that could never suffer so unlawful a thing to be done by one of her children. I confess, I cannot think the Holy Ghost could ever be in such councils: and it is very strange that, if the bishops had no design but (as they say) the restoring us to the doctrine of the primitive Church, they should never think upon it till Henry VIII made the breach upon so unlawful a pretence. These scruples being raised, I began to consider of the difference between the Catholics and us; and examined them as well as I could by the Holy Scriptures, which, though I do not pretend to be able to understand, yet there are some things I found so easy, that I cannot but wonder I had been so long without finding them out: as the real presence in the Blessed Sacrament, the infallibility of the Church, confession, and praying for the dead. After this, I spoke severally to two of the best bishops [1] we have in England, who both told me there were many things in the Roman Church which it were very much to be wished we had kept: as confession, which was, no doubt,

[1] Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Blandfort, Bishop of Worcester.

commanded by God; that praying for the dead was one of the ancient things in Christianity; that, for their parts, they did it daily, though they would not own it. And afterwards pressing one of them very much upon the other points, he[1] told me that if he had been bred a Catholic, he would not change his religion; but, that being of another Church, wherein he was sure were all things necessary to salvation, he thought it very ill to give that scandal as to leave that Church wherein he had received his baptism.

All these discourses did but add more to the desire I had to be a Catholic: and gave me the most terrible agonies in the world, within myself. For all this, fearing to be rash in a matter of that weight, I did all I could to satisfy myself; made it my daily prayer to God to settle me in the right; and so went on Christmas Day to receive in the King's chapel; after which I was more troubled than ever, and could never be in quiet till I had told my desire to a Catholic, who brought a priest to me; and that was the first I ever did converse with, upon my word. The more I spoke to him, the more I was confirmed in my design: and, as it is impossible for me to doubt of the words of our blessed Saviour, who says the holy sacrament is his body and blood; so I cannot believe that he who is the Author of all truth, and who has promised to be with his Church to the end of the world, would permit them to give that holy mystery to the laity but in one kind, if it were not lawful so to do.

I am not able, nor, if I were, would I enter into disputes with anybody. I only, in short, say this for the changing of my religion, which I take God to witness I would never have done if I had thought it possible to save my soul otherwise. I think I need not say it is not any interest in this world leads me to it. It will be plain enough to everybody that I must lose all the friends and credit I have here by it; and have very well weighed which I could best part with, my share in this world or the next. I thank God I found no difficulty in the choice.

My only prayer is that the poor Catholics of this nation may not suffer for my being of their religion; that God would but give me patience to bear them, and then send me any afflictions in this world, so I may enjoy a blessed eternity hereafter.

St. James's, August 20, 1670.

I am sensible this piece will make a more powerful impression upon minds that are sincere than the strongest arguments I can produce. For in disputes all men are naturally upon their guard,

[1] Blandfort, Bishop of Worcester.

as in an enemy's country; and suspect there lies a fallacy hid in every argument that presses too hard upon them. But in this piece there is nothing but plain matter of fact, delivered with such an air of sincerity and candor as prevents all suspicion of fallacious dealing, and finds its way to the heart without resistance. I will only add this one reflection, that there is not a Protestant in the world, but if he traces the reformation of the church whereof he is a member to its source, will find that either avarice, ambition, revenge, or some other criminal passion gave a beginning to it.

CHAPTER XXX

SOME FEW OF THE MANY REASONS WHICH MUST FOREVER ATTACH A ROMAN CATHOLIC TO HIS RELIGION

"This shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein." Isa. xxxv. 8.

WHY are you a Roman Catholic?

Because, as I am convinced there can be but one true religion, so I am equally convinced that no other than the Roman Catholic Religion can be this true one.

Why do you think there can be but one true religion?

First, Because reason itself shows it. Secondly, Because it is clearly declared in the Scripture.

How does reason show that there can be but one true religion?

It must appear evident, when we consider in what true religion consists. The true religion is that pure and holy worship of God, which he himself approves and commands; which is really worthy of his infinite majesty; which is grounded on his unerring truth and his adorable sanctity. It is that religion whose doctrines are true, and whose precepts are holy. That such are the characters of the true religion cannot be contested. But it is plain that these characters cannot belong to more than one religion; for God cannot approve as pure, and holy, and worthy of him, any one religion, without disapproving every other that is contrary thereto. If the doctrine taught in one religion be true, the contrary doctrines taught in other religions must be false. If the precepts or rules of conduct inculcated by one religion lead to virtue and holiness, whatever is opposite to these must lead to vice and ungodliness. We cannot therefore admit different true religions, without attributing

contradictions and inconsistencies to God himself. Whence it appears, that it is equally impossible there should be more than one true religion, as it is that there should be more than one true God.

How does it appear from Scripture, that there can be but one true religion?

Innumerable passages of the Scripture show it. But we shall content ourselves with a few that are plain to the weakest capacity.

First, Jesus Christ came, as he says himself,[1] to gather all nations together, to bring back all who had been dispersed, that there might be but one sheepfold and one shepherd. It was therefore contrary to his intention, that people should be separated and divided into different sheepfolds, that is to say, into different communions.

Secondly, he also came[2] to establish his spiritual kingdom throughout the whole earth. But how could the Eternal Wisdom, who had expressed in the most forcible terms,[3] the desolation threatening a kingdom divided in itself, expose his own kingdom to such a danger? Yet this he certainly would have done, had he authorized different religions, whose opposition to each other in belief, and in rule of conduct, must be an endless source of dissensions and divisions.

Thirdly, it was the constant prayer of our divine Saviour, while on earth, that all his disciples should be *one*, as he and his heavenly Father were one. He must therefore have established that plan of worship which, uniting all in the same faith, same hope, and same love, could alone promote what he so earnestly had at heart.

[1] "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." John x. 16.

"And not only for the nation, but to gather together the children of God that were dispersed." *Ibid.* xi. 52.

"That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee: that they all may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." *Ibid.* xvii. 21.

[2] All the Gospels.

[3] "And Jesus, knowing their thoughts, said to them: Every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand." Matt. xii. 25.

Fourthly, the apostles were sent[1] by Jesus Christ to teach all nations the same heavenly doctrines he had taught them; to administer to them all the same baptism; and to preach to them all the same Christ or Redeemer. By which it is plain no room is left for variety or difference. Hence St. Paul declares that there is but one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism (Eph. iv. 5).

Fifthly, Jesus Christ established but one Church for all nations, as is evident from his own words to St. Peter:[2] You are Peter (or the Rock), and on this Rock I build my Church (not churches); and also from these words: "He that will not hear the Church (not churches) let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." Now all must allow, if there be but one Church, there is but one religion.

As it seems evident, from the reasons alleged, that there can be, and that there is, but one true religion, the great point to be discussed is, why you look upon the Roman Catholic Religion to be that only true one.

First, because it is the only religion that can unite all nations and all ages in the same religious sentiments.

Secondly, because it is the only religion that can afford people reasonable grounds of certainty with regard to their faith.

Thirdly, because it is the only religion whose method of instructing is adapted to the nature of man.

Fourthly, because it is the religion which, of all others, shows best our Saviour's love for mankind, and holds him forth to us in the most amiable light.

Fifthly, because it is the only Christian Society that can, in a manner plain to the weakest capacity, trace up its origin to Christ and his apostles.

[1] "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20.

[2] "And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

Sixthly, because it is the only Christian Society that has not violated the ninth article of the Creed.

How do you show that the Roman Catholic Religion is the only one that can unite all nations and all ages in the same religious sentiments?

The Roman Catholic Religion holds that Jesus Christ has established a Church which is to extend to all nations and last throughout all ages: in which he and his Holy Spirit will always reside, and teach all truths to the end of time. That the pastors of this Church, as being the successors of the apostles, have from Christ's own mouth their divine commission to instruct and guide the faithful, together with his promise of being with them himself constantly till the end of the world. Whether these tenets be true, is not now the question—that shall be discussed in the sequel. But on these grounds it is that the Roman Catholic Church has always claimed as its prerogative, an authority derived from Christ, to which every individual must yield strict obedience and firm assent in religious matters.

This authority, constantly subsisting, is what prevents any difference or disunion in religion among Roman Catholics, and secures them from the danger of being, as St. Paul says,[1] carried about by every wind of doctrine. Because, as it lays down one and the same rule for all to follow, it must tend to unite all in the same religious sentiments.

But no such bond of union subsists in any other religion. For it is by rejecting and disclaiming any such authority that those of other religions have from the beginning endeavored, and still endeavor, to justify their separation from the Roman Catholic Church. Their great principle is, that they are to judge and decide for themselves; the consequence whereof must be, and in fact is, a strange variety in religious belief, and a daily splitting and dividing into new sects.

Wherefore, it appears evident that the Roman Catholic Religion is not only calculated, but it is also the only religion

[1] Eph. iv. 14.

calculated, to unite all nations and ages in the same religious sentiments.

How do you show that the Roman Catholic Religion is the only one that can afford people reasonable grounds of certainty with regard to their faith?

Every one knows that the grounds of certainty a Roman Catholic has for his faith, are that authority of the Church which we have just been speaking of; whereas the grounds of certainty any other person has, are only his own judgment, or, what is the same thing, that interpretation of Scripture which in his opinion is the true one. Now the Roman Catholic is certain that the Church will not mislead him; but a person of any other religion has no reason to be certain but he may be misled by his own opinion or judgment; wherefore the former has reasonable grounds of certainty with regard to his faith; the latter has not.

But how do you show that the Roman Catholic has every reason to be assured the Church will not mislead him?

From the very nature of religion, the Roman Catholic sees the necessity of an authority, in order to decide all controversies that may arise, and to preserve union; he knows that without subordination there can be nothing but confusion in either church or state, and that, without an authority which all are bound to acknowledge, there can be no subordination; he sees that shaking off the yoke of authority to become one's own guide in the affair of religion must directly tend to pride, to obstinacy, and to every species of religious frenzy; he sees that those famous heresies which heretofore distracted the Christian world, have all arisen from this want of submission; that it is the essential character of every heresy to be maintained in opposition to the Church's authority; which gave St. Augustine occasion to say that he might err, but would not be a heretic;[1] meaning that he was secured from heresy by his disposition of ready obedience to the Church. The Roman Catholic fur-

[1] A heretic is one who has an opinion, for such is the etymology of the word. What is understood by having an opinion, is following one's own fancy and particular sentiment. A Catholic, without maintaining any particular sentiment, follows unhesitatingly the doctrine of the Church, which Christ has promised to be with all days, even to the end of the world.

ther sees, that the bulk of mankind, through their ignorance, their weakness of understanding, and their several avocations, being incapable of examining the Scriptures, or of judging for themselves, must unavoidably rely upon authority.

From these motives of plain reason and common sense, the Roman Catholic is sufficiently convinced that to be guided by authority is his indispensable duty; if it be his duty, it is therefore what God requires of him; and surely, by doing what God requires of him, he cannot go astray. Thus, even without any help from Scripture, the Roman Catholic is assured he cannot be misled by following the authority of the Church.

This conviction of his mind, already so well grounded in reason, is fully strengthened and confirmed when he comes to read those clear and positive texts of Scripture,[1] which show that Jesus Christ himself gave his authority to the pastors of the Church;[2] that he commanded all to hear and obey them as himself; that he would take as offered to himself any contempt or disobedience shown to them; that, in their functions of teaching and instructing, he himself would remain with them for all days until the end of the world; that he would send them the Spirit of Truth, who should abide with them and teach them all truth;[3] that whoever would not hear the Church should be considered as a heathen and a publican; that the gates of hell should not prevail against the Church;[4] that the Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth.

By these passages of Scripture, and many others that might

[1] "Peace be to you: as the Father hath sent me, I also send you. When he had said this, he breathed on them, and he said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." John xx. 21, 22, 23.

[2] "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." Luke x. 16.

[3] "And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever: the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him: but you shall know him, because he shall abide with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you orphans." John xiv. 16, 17, 18.

"The Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." *Ibid.* 26.

[4] "The House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." 1 Tim. iii. 10.

be alleged, the Roman Catholic has, from the word of God himself, an entire and evident confirmation of what his own reason had already told him of his Church's authority, whence, with the fullest confidence, he may rest assured that he cannot go astray under her guidance. Such are the grounds of certainty a Roman Catholic has with regard to his faith; and every person of candor must acknowledge they are just and reasonable.

Well, and how do you show that a person who differs from the Roman Catholic Church has reason to fear being led astray, by interpreting the Scripture according to his own opinion and judgment?

He surely has every reason to fear it, when he considers that to mistake an opinion is what daily happens to thousands and thousands, in other less difficult matters, as well as in religion. Is not this even what he himself must say of all those who, following their own opinion as he does, yet differ from him? Is it not even the nature of man to be liable to error of judgment? And what privilege can he plead, to be exempt from the common lot of mankind? Is it that he seeks the truth with more candor and sincerity than others do? Such a notion, however he may flatter himself with it, must appear presumption and folly in the eyes of others. Moreover, by persuading himself he cannot go astray in his own interpretation of Scripture, he assumes to himself that infallibility he denies the Roman Catholic Church. Besides all this, he has to encounter, against the certainty of his opinion, an argument which cannot possibly fail to make the deepest impression on an unbiassed person. I mean, that the sense he gives the Scripture is contrary to the sense in which it is understood by all the wise and learned men the Roman Catholic Church comprises within its pale, and contrary to what is acknowledged to have been believed by all Christendom at least for several ages. If, after all this, he persists in saying that he is sure he is right in following his own opinion and judgment, we can only beseech God to give him what Solomon begged of the Almighty for himself, that is, a docile heart. But it is sufficiently plain to whoever is open to conviction, that he has

THE WOMAN OF CANAAN

FROM THE PAINTING BY DROUAIS

"And behold, a woman of Canaan, . . . crying out, said to Jesus: 'Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David: my daughter is grievously troubled by a devil.' But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying: 'Send her away, for she crieth after us.' And he, answering, said: 'I was not sent but to the sheep that are lost of the house of Israel.' But she came and worshipped him, saying: 'Lord, help me.' But he answered, and said: 'It is not good to take the bread of the children, and to cast it to the dogs.' And she said: 'Yea, Lord: for the whelps also eat of the crumbs that fall from the table of their masters.' Then Jesus, answering, said to her: 'O woman, great is thy faith: be it done to thee as thou wilt.' And her daughter was cured from that hour."

no just cause to be assured he does not mistake in his opinion, and of course that he has no reasonable grounds of certainty with regard to his faith.

To sum up all in a word: Faith is of its own nature certain and infallible—opinion is not; whatever persuasion, therefore, is built on opinion, cannot be faith; hence there can be no true or real faith, but what is grounded on authority; that is, not only the authority of God revealing (which all sects pretend to), but also the authority of the Church, as the only sure channel through which the sense of revelation is conveyed to us.

How do you show that the Roman Catholic Religion is the only one whose method of instructing is adapted to the nature of man?

The Roman Catholic Religion instructs by the method of authority; and it is sufficiently clear, from what has been said in the answers to the foregoing questions, that this is the only method whereby—

First, the ignorant, the dull of apprehension, and those who have not leisure to examine the Scriptures—that is to say, the greater part of mankind—can be at all instructed; whereby—

Secondly, the learned themselves can be so instructed as to remove all fluctuation and doubt from their minds; whereby—

Thirdly, both learned and ignorant are so furnished with the same motives of belief, and the same foundation for their faith; whereby—

Fourthly, all heresies, schisms, and dissensions about religion are prevented; whereby—

Fifthly, the spirit of peace, of meekness, of humility, of diffidence in ourselves, of submission and obedience, that is to say, the characteristic virtues of a disciple of Christ, are inculcated and are formed in us; whereby that pride and presumption of the human heart which, as St. Paul says,[1] exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, is beat down and subdued, and bringeth into captivity every understanding to the obedience of Christ; whereby

[1] 2 Cor. x. 5.

we are guarded against the wildness of imagination, the illusions of self-love, the spirit of party, the bias of education, the influence of prejudice, and so many sources of error and vice; whereby, in short, that holy, that rational, that amiable religion, which Jesus Christ brought down from heaven as a blessing to mankind, can be taught, can be enforced, and can be constantly maintained.

Now, as the method of instructing by authority is that which answers all these heavenly purposes, and leads man to virtue and happiness in a manner conformable to his nature; and as the contrary method, whereby people are desired to shake off authority and judge for themselves, naturally leads to so great evils, and is so ill suited to the state and condition of mankind: it follows that the Roman Catholic Religion, which is the only one that instructs by authority, is also the only religion whose method of instructing is adapted to the nature of man.

But does not this doctrine, which enforces the necessity and the obligation of being guided by Church authority, tend to make people the vassals and slaves of churchmen? Are we to hoodwink our reason, and blindly to follow whatever the clergy say? Are they not men as well as others; and, as such, are they not liable to error? Might they not pervert their authority to bad purposes, and make us their dupes?

Objections of this sort, which, indeed, we but too often hear, proceed only from ignorance, pride, or passion; they must immediately vanish, if we but calmly listen to the voice of reason. The authority we are obliged to submit to is not that of any clergyman speaking or acting from himself; but it is the authority of the entire body of the pastors of the Church. Each clergyman, in the discharge of his functions, acts as the Church's deputy. It is in her name, and by her authority, he instructs and guides the faithful committed to his care. The submission and obedience paid him in this capacity is paid to the Church itself; and in obeying the Church, we obey Jesus Christ. Can this reasonable obedience (which regards only the concern of our souls) be called vassalage or slavery to churchmen? Or is it hoodwinking our reason to submit to what

is, in fact, the authority of God himself? That clergymen are only men, like others; that, as such, they are liable to error; that they might possibly pervert their authority to bad purposes: all this is certainly true. But though they be of themselves liable to error, and capable of abusing their authority, we have nothing to fear by giving ourselves up to their guidance, as long as they preach only the doctrine of the Church, and confine their authority to spiritual matters, for which alone it was given. If, indeed, any clergyman should happen to prove such a traitor to his trust as to give out a doctrine different from that of the Church (a matter which would immediately spread an alarm), or if he should be imprudent enough to enforce his authority, which is spiritual, in matters that are merely temporal, every one knows that in the former case he must, and in the latter he may, be disobeyed; because he then ceases to be invested with the authority of the Church and of Jesus Christ; and thus we are secured from the danger of being (what the enemies of our religion are so apt to call us) dupes of the clergy.

However, from all that has been said on this subject, no one can doubt but that, while a clergyman goes on in the ordinary course of those functions the Church has prescribed for him, he is entitled to the respect and obedience due to the minister of the Church of Jesus Christ; this quality is never to be overlooked, on account of any frailties of the person; and obedience cannot be refused without overturning the very foundations of faith: hence a disposition of revolt against the clergy, of disobedience to their authority, of aversion and contempt of them, carries with it all the malice and guilt of heresy; for by such a disposition every heresy is already formed in its cause; and from thence each particular heresy flows as a stream from its source.

How do you show that the Roman Catholic Religion is the religion which, of all others, shows best our Saviour's love for mankind, and holds him forth to us in the most amiable light?

From what has been already said, it plainly appears that the Roman Catholic Religion is the only one that represents our Divine Redeemer as fulfilling the duties of the best of parents, in procur-

ing us instructions the most proper and most suitable to our nature; in becoming even himself our Instructor, and thus performing his loving promise, that he would not leave us orphans; in giving us (beside himself, the Invisible Guide) a visible one we cannot mistake, that will guard us against going astray, and will direct us in that belief which, under pain of being eternally lost, is required of us. Our Divine Redeemer, however, is held forth to us by the Roman Catholic Religion as providing us with the most precious food for the preservation of our spiritual life; no other, indeed, than his own ever adorable Flesh and Blood, which he gives for nourishment of our souls in the sacrament of the altar. Whoever considers this, and has a heart susceptible of the love of his God, though he were not convinced of the truth of the Roman Catholic Religion, yet he should naturally wish it was true; as it must be our greatest happiness in this life to have such visible tokens of our Saviour's love, in the secure means of salvation he has left us; and to be so firmly assured of the ardent desire he has of being forever united with us in heaven, by the ways his love found out to be united with us in the closest manner on earth. Such is the amiable light in which our Saviour is held forth to us by the Catholic Religion: a light in which, it is plain, the tenets of any other religion will not allow us to view him.

How do you show that the Roman Catholic Church is the only Christian Society that can, in a manner plain to the weakest capacity, trace up its origin to Christ and his apostles?

As the Roman Catholic Church is a body of Christians united in faith and communion with the Pope or Bishop of Rome, their visible head; a Roman Catholic, therefore, in order to trace up his Church to Christ and his apostles, has nothing more to do than count back from the present Pope through the catalogue of his predecessors, till he comes to St. Peter, the first Pope and Bishop of Rome, to whom Christ [1] committed the care of feeding his lambs and his sheep; that is, his entire flock.[2] In this catalogue of Popes, not one has broken off from the line of succession, but all, continu-

[1] John xxi. 15, 16, 17. [2] See List of the Supreme Pontiffs, Volume I, page 65.

ing on in the same communion, governed each in his turn the Church he found established before him. Thus the Roman Catholic has a regular chain of Head Pastors of his Church—a chain whose links are closely joined and hang one to the other, from the first to the last; and every one must perceive with what ease a Roman Catholic may, by only following this chain, trace his Church to Christ and his apostles.

But if we attempt to trace the origin of any other sect or society of Christians, we find ourselves stopped as soon as we come to the author of that sect, and the time of its forming a separate congregation. Here the chain is broken; the line of succession is cut short: from that time only, and not higher, can the origin of that sect or society of Christians be dated; just in the same manner (to use an example) as the republic of Holland cannot be traced higher than about two hundred years ago, when the seven united provinces shook off the yoke of Spain, and formed themselves into a separate state; and as also the American Republic began only a century ago by separating from the empire of Great Britain, and cannot therefore attempt to date its origin at any earlier period. Such exactly is the case of every Christian society, except the Roman Catholic Church, whose origin reaches up to the apostles, while each of the others can go no higher than the time of its separation. And hence it appears plain to the weakest capacity, that it is only the Roman Catholic Church which can trace up its origin to Christ and his apostles.

How do you show that the Roman Catholic Church is the only Christian Society that has not violated the ninth article of the Creed?

The ninth article of the Creed is: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints"; by which words we declare that we hold as an article of our belief, a true Church of Christ constantly subsisting on earth, which is holy, which is Catholic (that is, universal), and which is that communion wherein the saints are found. Now it is plain that breaking off from this Church, which we thus in the Creed profess to believe, is certainly

violating or going against the ninth article of the Creed. But the Roman Catholic Church stands totally free from that charge, having, as all the world knows, never broken off from that standing body of Christians which, in all ages, has been called the Catholic Church; being, in fact, itself that very Church that has all along subsisted and borne the name of Catholic. Every other society of Christians, on the contrary, has broken off from this standing body, has quitted its communion, and formed as its origin a new church and congregation separate from all that was before it. By which it is evident that every one of these sects, however it may attempt to assign reasons for its separation, has by this very separation violated the ninth article of the Creed.

To render this argument quite short and decisive, we may thus reason with each and every one of these sects: At the time your church formed a separate communion, either there was a true Church of Christ subsisting on earth, or there was not. If there was, your church, by forming a separate communion, quitted and renounced this true Church of Christ. If you say there was not, then you give the lie to the Creed, inasmuch as you make it propose, as the object of our belief, a thing that did not exist.

Thus, without further inquiry, we see at once that all the different sects of Christians who are separated from the Roman Catholic Church carry on the very face of them their own condemnation.

But is it not very uncharitable to believe that the Roman Catholic Church, besides being the only true Church, is the only one in which salvation can be obtained?

It is by no means uncharitable to believe this; no more than it is uncharitable to believe any awful truth which God has revealed. No Christian can be justly charged with a want of charity for believing that many are called, but that few are chosen; that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven; that he who will not believe is already judged; that without faith it is impossible to please God; that there is but one Faith, one Lord, and one baptism; that he who will not hear the Church must be considered as

the heathen and the publican; or, in short, that Christ, at the last day, shall thus sentence the reprobate: "Go, ye cursed, into eternal fire." As the firm belief of all these, and the other terrifying truths which frequently occur in Holy Writ, and which are manifestly damnatory of the great majority of mankind as well at this day as in former ages, does not clash with charity: so neither does the doctrine of exclusive salvation. Our Saviour, who was charity itself—his prophets and apostles, who were animated with the same divine spirit—did all respectively deliver these formidable oracles, while their hearts glowed with the tenderest love of the unhappy objects who had fallen under God's displeasure. Turks, Jews, atheists, and the numberless infidel tribes may as justly upbraid with a want of charity every denomination of Christians who assent to the Athanasian Creed, or who admit the necessity of baptism and divine faith, as our separated brethren upbraid us Roman Catholics for believing that there is only one true religion revealed by the God of Truth, and that the Roman Catholic Religion is that true one. If separated Christian communities have, in their own opinion, an indisputable claim to charity, while they unhesitatingly pronounce the Roman Catholic Religion "damnable and idolatrous," though professed by the greater part of Christendom, it is doubtless because they conceive that such sentiments and language are dictated by truth, and because their conscience bears them testimony that they are sincerely well affected to Roman Catholics and infidels, while they thus, however reluctantly, condemn them. Now, Roman Catholics feel warranted to assert their claim to the tenderest charity upon the very same grounds. To them it appears as undeniable as the very existence of the Godhead, that the religion revealed by him must be essentially one, consistent throughout, and perfectly accordant in all it prescribes and professes. To assert that God can declare to one body of Christians that certain points are to be believed, and to another that they are not to be believed, is to attribute to him what is incompatible with his very nature: it would authorize the infidelity of the atheist, who may then triumphantly boast that he can never be justly condemned for refusing to believe

in a God who contradicts himself. It is not less incredible that, among the multitude of religions, more than one can be right. But while Roman Catholics, weighing maturely the distinctive qualities of the Church established by Jesus Christ, perceive that these qualities exclusively belong to that ancient and widely extended body of Christians in communion with the See of Rome, they at the same time declare, in the face of heaven and earth, that they are strictly bound to love their neighbor; and that every human being, let his religion, his practice, or his prejudice be what they may, is that very neighbor whom they are bound to love. They further, with equal solemnity, declare that as to live in hatred of any denomination whatsoever of their fellow-creatures is to live in enmity with God, so to die in such hatred is to forfeit heaven, to die reprobated. Roman Catholics also, while they believe their own religion to be the only true one, are convinced that great numbers are comprised within its pale who do not adhere to it by any visible bond of communion. All baptized infants; all innocent children of every religious persuasion; and all grown-up Christians who have preserved their baptismal innocence, though they make no outward profession of the Catholic faith, are yet claimed as her children by the Roman Catholic Church. Neither have we any difficulty in believing, with many individuals of our communion, that there are several in our own land, as well as in other countries, professing the religion by law established there, whose uniform integrity of life, whose ardent love of God, and sincere disposition to embrace the truth, if they but knew it, not only open for them the road to salvation, but afford them more solid grounds to expect that blessing than those Roman Catholics have who live in constant disobedience to the dictates of their religion, and who deny, by their practice, the faith which they profess.

Are Roman Catholics taught to believe, or to assert, that all those of other religions will be damned?

No; most assuredly they are not. If ignorance, embittered by resentment, has ever given utterance to similar expressions, these are not the language of Roman Catholics as such; which fully

appears by the foregoing answer, and is further manifest from their being taught to believe that God alone knows who shall be his by faith and good works; that many are not now the people of God, who shall one day be numbered in his inheritance; that many shall come from the East and from the West, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the children of that kingdom shall be excluded. Moreover, final perseverance is a most profound secret, absolutely impervious to mortals; it is pent up in the bosom of the Deity. No man, without special revelation, can ascertain what passes, at the moment of death, between the dying Christian and his God. It is ours earnestly to desire eternal happiness for every fellow-creature; to work out our salvation with fear and trembling; not to be high-minded, nor to judge others, that we ourselves be not judged; but to hope humbly for all, in the infinite mercies of God, through Jesus Christ.

But, at least, is it not very uncharitable in Roman Catholics to abjure all manner of communication in religious exercises with those of every other religion?

This abjuration, or refusal, so far from being uncharitable, is in their mind enforced by the truest charity. Convinced as Roman Catholics are, and firmly persuaded that there is, and there can be, no other true religion than their own, they cannot consistently nor candidly nor lawfully approve, or even appear to approve, any other religion; which they certainly should appear to do were they thus to join in these religious exercises, or frequent places of worship belonging to separated communions. Such temporizing conduct has the aspect of prevarication; it is, in short, betraying the truth of God. In their principles they must abhor it, as calculated to delude their separated brethren into an unfounded, and therefore into a most dangerous, security. Charity here compels them to stand off. Besides, esteeming the gift of divine faith to be invaluable, inasmuch as, without faith, it is impossible to please God, they cannot innocently expose themselves to the danger of losing it.

But still, when those of other religions scruple not, occasion-

ally, to attend at Roman Catholic sermons, and at religious exercises in Roman Catholic places of worship, would there not be something more brotherly in returning this compliment than in standing off with such rigor?

The preceding answer has anticipated a negative to this question; it is now, in addition, to be observed that the principles of other religions allow of such communication; the principles of the Roman Catholic Religion peremptorily forbid it. Were a set of men, however individually respectable, to assemble as a deliberative body, with a view of reforming what they deem abuses in the constitution of Great Britain, were these men to propose to the imperial parliament a coalition with the legislative body, whereby they should be entitled to assist at the deliberations of parliament, and the members of the legislature be admissible to sit with them in turn, every one is aware of the fate of such a proposal; and every one who is convinced of the essential unity of the Church, as well as of its necessary and indefectible identity, in every age from its first establishment by Christ to the end of the world, must consistently reject, with at least equal aversion, every similar proposal of religious reciprocity.

Can it, then, be sinful to listen to the Word of God? Is not his Word good in all places, and wherever it is preached?

The pure, unadulterated Word of God is certainly good in itself everywhere; but all is not the Word of God which passes under that name. The original Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Greek manuscripts are no longer in existence: there are a great number of copies, indeed, and very many translations; but copies can so far only be the Word of God, as they are faithful transcripts of the originals; and translations are that word no farther than they truly express the sense of it. Now, it is undeniable that numberless spurious copies are in circulation, corrupted by Jews and ancient Eastern heretics; so that, abstracting from the testimony of the Church, the authorized guardian of the Scriptures and voucher of their authenticity, there can be no certain assurance that any individual copy or translation is indeed the Word of God: a circum-

stance of such weight, in the judgment of the great St. Augustine, as made him declare that he would not receive the four Gospels if not induced thereto by the authority of the Catholic Church. And if the Scriptures so far back as the time of St. Peter, when the living voice of the apostles discriminated for the faithful the pure from the corrupt, could still be wrested by the unlearned and unstable to their own perdition, how much more liable are these Scriptures now to misconceptions and misrepresentations among the sects, where the authority of that Church is rejected, and where the Scriptures are presumptuously expounded according to the dictates of private judgment! When it is also notorious that various translations have, in many places, forced the Word of God into such meanings, and into such language, as might best accord with the peculiar tenets of the translators,[1] or might best seem to warrant their defection from the Catholic Church, it becomes equally notorious that arbitrary translations of that sort cannot be safely relied on as the pure Word of God.

Even among the English reformed translations, some of a later date have altered and superseded others which, in their day, were publicly read as the pure Word of God; these latter translations having been superseded in turn themselves by others still later. A petition was presented to King James I by a number of zealous Protestants, wherein they represent that in the translation of the Psalms, as found in the Book of Common Prayer, there were two hundred deviations from the truth; and the petitioners grounded their objections against this book almost entirely upon the corruptions or mistranslations which they discovered in it, as set forth in a particular treatise entitled " A Defence of the Minister's Reasons for Refusal of Subscribing."

Mr. Carlisle, a Protestant writer of that period, abused the English translations, as having " depraved the sense; obscured the truth; deceived the ignorant; distorted the Scriptures; and preferred darkness to light; falsehood to truth "; etc., etc.

[1] It is a fact that Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Beza, Bucer, etc., etc., assailed and censured with the utmost asperity each other's translation of the Bible. (See their respective works.)

The ministers of the diocese of Lincoln, in their address to the King, charge the English translation with taking from and adding to the text, so as to change or obscure the meaning of the Holy Ghost. They further pronounce this same translation " absurd and senseless," on which account they scruple to subscribe to it.

Mr. Broughton, a most decided Protestant, wrote about this time to the Lords of the Council, in order to procure, through their interference, a new translation, because the one then in use was, according to him, " full of errors." In his " Advertisement of Corruptions," he tells the bishops that their public translation of the Scriptures into English " perverts " the text of the Old Testament in eight hundred and forty-eight places. Very many faults of copies are to be found even in the Vatican and Alexandrian manuscripts of the Bible. In the Greek New Testament alone, Mr. Mills has discovered thirty thousand various readings.

But if, instead of translations absolutely rejected by the Catholic Church, her Vulgate [1] alone were in use among the separated communions—that Vulgate which she presents to us from the faithful pen of the learned and laborious St. Jerome, and which the most distinguished opposers [2] of Catholicity have mentioned with respect—it would not yet be lawful for us Roman Catholics to commune in religious matters with separated sects, or to listen to their teachers as our spiritual guides.

And why?

Besides the reason heretofore assigned, Roman Catholics cannot discover in these teachers that transmissive spiritual authority emanating, through an unbroken chain of succession, from Christ himself and his apostles; which authority they consider as essentially necessary in every preacher to constitute him an orthodox minister of the Word of God. For as a Roman Catholic cannot

[1] St. Jerome undertook and executed this translation at the instance of Pope Damasus. He translated the Old Testament from the Hebrew, and revised the New Testament from the Greek. His labors on this occasion are highly extolled by St. Augustine.

[2] Mr. Whitacre, Dr. Dove, Dr. Humphry, Dr. Covel, Molinæus, Pelican, and Beza respectively allow that the Vulgate is pious and profitable to the Church, faithful to the original, preferable to all other Latin translations, etc., etc.

allow any other society of Christians to be the true Church, except that which acknowledges the spiritual preëminence of our chief Bishop, and holds communion with his See as of indispensable necessity: so, neither can a Roman Catholic conscientiously become a hearer of those whose commission to preach or expound the Gospel is not manifestly and actually derived from that authority. How shall they preach unless they be sent? Among all the illustrious personages under the old law, none took upon themselves the province of public instruction, but such as were called by God, as Aaron was. The prophet Jeremiah rests his own claim to credit, and the claim of the other prophets, upon this particular circumstance, that God had sent them. He repeats it with reiterated energy in many parts of his prophecy; insisting in other places, as often and with equal force, that the false prophets were not to be credited, because, though they spoke in the name of God, yet that God had not sent them. Our Redeemer, the great Teacher of mankind, would be particularly characterized by this quality, as well in the noted oracle of the dying patriarch who announced the continuance of the sceptre in Juda until he should come who was to be sent, as in the prophetic prayer of Moses, " Send, O Lord, whom thou wilt send "; also in the words of his precursor: " He whom God hath sent shall speak the words of God "; wherefore Jesus Christ studiously exhibits this distinctive quality as prominent in his own Person: " But I," says he, " have a greater testimony than that of John; for the works themselves which I do, give testimony of me, that the Father hath sent me." When about to raise Lazarus from the dead, he clearly implies his motive in performing this miracle to be that the surrounding multitude might believe that the Father had sent him. On another occasion he proves to the Jews how justly he ought to be called the Son of God because the Father had sanctified and sent him into the world. He declared that eternal life consists in knowing the Father, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he had sent. After all which, commissioning his apostles to preach the Gospel to the world, he says: " As the Father hath sent me, I also send you "; and in his last discourse on the eve

of his death: "Amen, Amen, I say to you, he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me." The word *apostle* signifies " a man sent." But when the chain of transmissive spiritual jurisdiction is broken by a separation from the visible body of pastors united under one visible head, Roman Catholics cannot perceive that teachers so separated are really sent to instruct them, nor can they of course become their hearers.

Are heavy temporal inconveniences a sufficient excuse for Roman Catholics, when, through fear of incurring them, they yield compliance in this point?

Such compliance being repugnant to their religious principles, it cannot be fairly required of them, nor lawfully conceded, whatever temporal inconveniences may result from their refusal. Let all those who chance to be involved in such trying circumstances, whether placemen, servants, or dependents, be careful to prove, by their edifying conduct, by their honesty, their fidelity, and their uniform attention to their employers' interest and welfare, that the religion of their preference effectually inculcates every Christian virtue in an eminent degree. No violence will then be offered to their consciences; they will be left at full liberty to adore their God in their own way; they must become respectable and respected in this very act of recusancy.

BOOK VIII

MASS AND THE SACRAMENTS

CHAPTER XXXI

THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

Sacrifice offered from of old to God alone—The Mass prefigured in the Old Testament—The same sacrifice as that of the Cross—Foretold by the Prophet Malachias (Malachi)—Frequency of celebration—Hour of Mass—Application of the Holy Sacrifice—High and Low Mass—Missa cantata; publica; privata; parochialis—Capitular, Conventual, and Votive Masses—Missa adventitia—Mass of the Presanctified—The Passion and death of Jesus in the Mass—"The Hidden Treasure of the Holy Mass"—The Eucharist—Instituted by Christ himself—The real presence—Transubstantiation—Mode of Christ's presence—Ministration and effects of the Eucharist—The Eucharist as a sacrifice—Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament.

SACRIFICE is an external act of supreme religious worship given to God alone. In our hearts we adore and praise God; but by sacrifice we pay external, outward homage to the Deity. We confess God the Sovereign Lord and Master of all creation—of life and of death. We profess our entire subjection to him, and total dependence on his gracious Providence. The light of reason and the laws of nature, engraven by God on the human heart, point out sacrifice as an essential part of the worship of the Supreme Being. Hence we find that all nations, however barbarous, adored the Deity, whether true or false, by sacrifice. In the true faith, from the beginning of the world to the end, sacrifice has never ceased, and never shall cease.

In the Old Testament, the patriarchs worshipped the true God by sacrifice. Witness that of Abel;[1] of Noah;[2] of Melchisedech;[3] of Abraham;[4] as also of holy Job, David, Solomon, and many others. The sacrifices of the old law consisted chiefly of living creatures, such as lambs, oxen, goats, etc., and sometimes of inanimate things, such as fine flour, oil, cakes, etc., and the bread and wine of Melchisedech. These sacrifices had no intrinsic value of

[1] Genesis v. [2] *Ibid.* viii. [3] *Ibid.* xiv. [4] *Ibid.* xv.

themselves. St. Paul calls them "poor and weak elements," incapable, of themselves, of cancelling sin or conferring grace. "It is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats sins should be taken away." [1] "Shall I," said the Lord, "eat the flesh of bullocks, or shall I drink the blood of goats?" [2] "With burnt-offerings thou wilt not be delighted." [3] They were but mere types and figures of the great sacrifice of the New Law, and from this alone they derived all their value and became pleasing to God. The victims slain, and the blood offered on the altar, were types of the bloody sacrifice of Jesus Christ on Mount Calvary, and of the unbloody one of Jesus on the altar. On Calvary the Victim of infinite value, Jesus Christ, was slain, his blood offered up in atonement, and all mankind redeemed.

The Mass! What is the Mass? The Mass, in one word, is the very same sacrifice as that of the cross. The High Priest in the Mass is the same Jesus Christ; the Victim offered up in the Mass, the same Jesus Christ. The same precious blood is offered in atonement on the cross and on the altar. The Mass is not a simple representation; it is the essence, the truth, the reality of Calvary. The Council of Trent says: "The same Christ is contained and immolated [on the altar] in an unbloody manner, who once offered himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross." "For the Victim is one and the same; the same now offering himself by the ministry of priests, who then offered himself on the cross." The only difference is the manner of offering. On the cross Jesus offered his blood, and actually died; on the altar the same Jesus offers the same blood, and mystically dies; that is, his death is represented by the separate consecration of the bread and wine, which denotes the separation of his sacred blood from his body. The sacrifice of Calvary is the infinite ocean of redemption: the sacrifice of the Mass is the application of that of Calvary to the souls of men. In the Mass we have a standing memorial of the death of Christ. The memory of his Passion is daily renewed, and the merits of his blood are applied to our souls. The Victim slain

[1] Hebrews x. 4. [2] Psalm xlix. 13. [3] *Ibid.* l. 18.

THE LAST SUPPER

FROM THE PAINTING BY PHILIPPE CHAMPAGNE

is of infinite value—Jesus Christ himself. Infinite is the sanctity of the High Priest, Jesus Christ, who, as St. Paul says, "is holy, innocent, without spot, separated from sinners, and elevated above the heavens;" [1] and infinite glory is given to the adorable Trinity. The Mass is the very soul of the Christian religion; the most sublime and august mystery of our holy faith; the most sacred function that can be performed on earth. "We must needs confess," says the Council of Trent, "that no other work can be performed by the faithful so holy and divine as this tremendous mystery, wherein the life-giving Victim, by which we were reconciled to the Father, is daily immolated on the altar by priests."

The great sacrifice of the Mass will end only with the end of time. At the Last Supper, when the Redeemer celebrated the first Mass, and "gave his body and his blood for the remission of sins," he ordained his disciples priests of the New Testament, and commanded them and their lawful successors to the end of time to offer the same holy sacrifice. "Do this," says Christ, "for a commemoration of me." [2] That is, as St. Paul explains it, to show forth his death till his second coming.[3] St. Paul again proves, in emphatic words, that the priesthood of Christ shall never end. "The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent: thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech." [4]

The prophet Malachias (Malachi) had foretold, long before St. Paul, that this sacrifice would last forever. He says, in words the most beautiful: "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts; and I will not receive a gift of your hand: for from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts." [5] The Protestant church, which has neither priest, nor victim, nor altar, nor oblation, cannot pretend to fulfil this prophecy. She has left the fold of Christ, the bark of Peter, and is in the way of error. But in the Catholic

[1] Hebrews vii. 26. [2] Luke xxii. 19. [3] 1 Cor. xi. 26.
[4] Hebrews vii. 17, 21. [5] Mal. i. 10, 11.

Church, built upon the rock of Peter, whose fair face neither error, nor heresy, nor old age has ever sullied; the Catholic Church, the virgin spouse of Christ, ever ancient and ever new; in her ever have been, and ever shall be, altar and sacrifice: in her, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, the name of the Lord shall be great; and on countless altars, on behalf of millions and millions of souls, the clean oblation of the sacrifice of the Mass shall be offered to the Lord of Hosts.

CUSTOMS AND REGULATIONS CONCERNING MASS

FREQUENCY OF CELEBRATION.—In early times the bishop and priests celebrated together. This custom seems to have continued in Rome long after it had ceased elsewhere, being mentioned by Amalarius of Metz in the ninth century, and later still by Innocent III. It has not yet entirely died out, for at the Mass of Ordination the newly ordained priests say Mass jointly with the bishop, though they do not partake of the same Host or of the Precious Blood. In churches outside the city, priests celebrated independently; on the other hand, the priests of the Roman *tituli*, practically equivalent to urban parishes, used the Host consecrated and sent to them by the Pope.

Ordinarily speaking, then (an exception will be noted presently), there was but one Mass each day in the same church, and this is still the custom of the Greeks and Orientals, unless where, as in the case of Uniates, they have been influenced by Western practice. Nor was Mass said everywhere on all days of the week. It may perhaps be inferred from Acts ii. 42, 46, that the apostles celebrated the Agape, ending with the Eucharist, daily. Justin, however, speaks of the Eucharistic celebration only on Sunday.[1] St. Augustine informs us that in some places there was Mass daily, in others only on Sundays, in others on Saturdays and Sundays.[2] Mass was said daily in Africa,[3] in Rome and Spain,[4] at Milan,[5]

[1] Apol. i. 67.
[2] Ep. 54, Ad Januar.
[3] Cyprian, Ep. 58.
[4] Hieron., Ep. 71, Ad Lucin.
[5] Ambrose (quoted by Le Brun), lib. ii. ep. 14, Ad Marc.

at Antioch and Constantinople.[1] But at Cæsarea, St. Basil tells us, Mass was said only on Sundays, Fridays, and Saturdays, and on the feasts of the martyrs. Of course, when we speak of Mass every day, we except Good Friday in the Roman Church, and all the days of Lent except Saturdays and Sundays in the Church of Constantinople.

On many occasions Mass was reiterated by the same celebrant where now one Mass would be said and a commemoration made or more than one Mass said by different celebrants.

But, on Christmas Day, against the rule which prevails on every other day in the year, priests are allowed to celebrate three Masses. Two Masses used to be said on January 1—one Mass of the octave of the Nativity, another of the Blessed Virgin. Three Masses were said on Holy Thursday—one for the reconciliation of penitents, another for the consecration of the holy chrism, a third to commemorate the solemnity of the day. Two Masses were said on the Ascension—one of the vigil, and another of the feast. A Roman "Ordo" mentions the custom of saying three Masses on the feast of St. John Baptist, while it appears from Prudentius that the Popes used to celebrate two Masses on the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul—one in the Vatican basilica, another in the Church of St. Paul. To return to Christmas Day: the Roman "Ordines" prove that the Popes used on that feast to say three Masses—the first in the Liberian basilica; the second in the Church of St. Anastasia, whose memory is celebrated on the same day, December 25; the third in the Vatican church. In other places, particularly in France, the same priest used to say two Masses on Christmas Day. When the Roman "Ordo" was received in France by the command of Charlemagne, the Roman custom of saying three Masses was introduced in France also, the privilege being given first of all to bishops only, and then to priests also. To sum up: throughout the Church, or at least in a great part of it, there were two Masses—one for the vigil of Christmas, another for the feast itself. At Rome there were three, because the feast

[1] Chrys., in Ephes., Hom. iii. d.

of St. Anastasia fell on the same day; and the Roman custom spread throughout the West. Those three Masses, however, were always said, not together, but at considerable intervals—namely, at midnight, dawn, and in the daytime—a custom still observed in cathedral and collegiate churches. A mystical explanation of the three Masses is given, and they are supposed to figure the three births of our Lord—namely, of his Father before all ages, of the Blessed Virgin, and in the hearts of the faithful.

An old chronicler (Albertus Argentimensis) relates that during the Christmas Mass celebrated "at cock-crow," Charlemagne stood with drawn sword and read the Gospel, "A decree went forth from Cæsar Augustus." Martene mentions the ancient custom, according to which the emperor, or, failing him, any sovereign who was present in the Papal chapel on Christmas night, used to read the fifth lesson in the office, with his sword in his hand. "At present," says Benedict XIV, "on Christmas night the Pope blesses a ducal cap and sword, which he either gives to some prince who is there, or else sends it as a present."[1]

Pope Alexander II forbade any priest to say Mass more than once in the day, and his enactment is incorporated in the "Decretum" of Gratian. The Pope, however, mentions, and apparently without disapproval, the habit of saying two Masses daily, "one of the day, another for the dead." St. Anselm and St. Albert are said by Meratus to have done so. Mr. Maskell collects many English canons prohibiting the repetition of Mass on the same day by the same priest.[2] Thus a Provincial Constitution of Archbishop Langton prohibits any one from celebrating more than once a day except on Christmas and Easter Sunday, and on occasion of a funeral in the church; and one of the last injunctions published in England before the change of religion was, that "no priest say two Masses in one day, except Christmas Day, without express licence."

Devotion led some holy persons at the same period in quite an opposite direction. St. Thomas of Canterbury did not celebrate daily; and a contemporary, noting this, says the practice of priests

[1] Benedict XIV, De Festis. [2] Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, p. 228.

on this point varied: that those who celebrated often were to be commended for the purity of their lives; those who acted like St. Thomas, for their humility.[1] Mass was said rarely among the Carthusians, and St. Francis of Assisi, in his "Testament," wished one priest only to celebrate each day in his convents. The other priests were to content themselves with hearing Mass.[2]

By the present law priests are strictly prohibited from saying Mass more than once on any day except Christmas Day. Bishops, however, have often leave to celebrate, or allow their priests to celebrate, twice on a Sunday or holiday of obligation, if a large number of people would otherwise be unable to hear Mass; and most priests in English-speaking countries hold faculties, renewed at intervals, to this effect. The ablutions must not be taken at the first Mass. Pope Leo XIII, moved by the necessity of the case, permitted bishops in Mexico to have three Masses celebrated by one priest on the same day. No law requires a priest, as such, to celebrate daily, and it is commonly held that he is not bound to do so except on the more solemn feasts.[3] A parish priest must say Mass at least whenever the people are bound to hear it. Modern saints—for example, St. Ignatius and St. Francis of Sales—strongly encourage priests to celebrate daily, and this is now the common, though by no means the universal, custom.

The hour of Mass was subject to no special regulation down to the middle of the fifth century, though it was usually said early in the morning. Le Brun thinks that the custom of saying Mass at tierce (that is, at 9 A.M.) began with the monks. It is mentioned by Cassian, Sidonius Apollinaris, a Council of Orleans in 511, and St. Gregory of Tours. On the stations—namely, Wednesday and Friday, and in Rome on Saturday (all usually fasting days), it was said at sext—*i.e.*, noon; on other fasting days, after none—*i.e.*, three o'clock; at ordinations the fast was continued through Friday or Saturday till the early morning of the day following, when the Mass was said. According to the present law,

[1] Fleury, H. E., livr. lxx. § 64.
[2] St. Liguori, Theol. Moral., lib. vi. § 313.
[3] *Ibid.* livr. lxxix. 25.

Mass must not be said before dawn or later than midday, and it is a serious matter notably to transgress these limits except in virtue of apostolic indult. The rule which requires the priest to have said Matins and Lauds previously is not so strict. There are special rules on the relations of Office and Conventual Mass, Mass of Requiem, etc., in the rubrics of the Missal.

The Application of Mass.—Mass is a sacrifice of adoration, of praise and thanksgiving; it is also a sacrifice of propitiation for sin, and a means of obtaining all graces and blessings from God. In the Canon of the Roman Mass and all other liturgies the sacrifice is always offered specially for certain persons—namely, for those present in the church, for those who contributed the bread and wine for the consecration, etc. Theologians, following Scotus, recognize a threefold fruit of the sacrifice. There is the general fruit, in which all the faithful participate; the more special fruit, which belongs to those for whom the priest specially offers the sacrifice; and the most special fruit, proper to the celebrant himself. The Canon of the Mass recognizes this distinction, and so bears witness to its antiquity. The celebrant offers "for thy holy Catholic Church"; again, he speaks of those "on whose account we offer to Thee, or who offer to Thee, this sacrifice of praise"; he also calls the Mass "the oblation of our ministry," and in an earlier part of the liturgy offers the Host "for my numberless sins and offences and negligences." Theologians dispute how far and in what way the effect of the oblation is limited, very many denying that there is any such limit except in the capacity of those for whom the offering is made, so that, for example, Mass said for a hundred persons would profit each as much as if said for one only. Practically, however, a priest has to act on the opinion that the effect of the sacrifice is limited by the ordination of Christ, or in some other manner over and above the limitation already mentioned. Here, then, it suffices to say that in "saying Mass" for a person or persons, a priest applies in their interest the more special fruit of the sacrifice. If under an obligation of making this application, he must not extend it to others save with the

implied condition that he does not intend to interfere with the rights of those who have the first claim. But of course he always offers generally for the whole Church, and reserves the special fruit of the Mass to himself. The following regulations exist with regard to the application.

All bishops and priests with cure of souls are bound to say Mass for their people on Sundays and holidays of obligation. If the holiday of obligation has become a day of devotion, the duty of saying Mass for the flock continues. Missionary priests are mere delegates of the bishop, without cure of souls in the strict sense. They are not, therefore, bound to offer the sacrifice on these days for the people in their district, though charity makes it fit that they should do so. In all cathedrals and collegiate churches the Conventual Mass (see below) must be said daily for benefactors, and chaplains, etc., are bound to say Mass daily for the founder of the chaplaincy or benefice, unless it appear from the terms of the foundation that this was not intended. Lastly, a strict obligation of saying Mass for the donor's intention is incurred by priests who accept an alms on that condition. This alms or stipend is meant for the celebrant's support, and corresponds to the offerings of bread and wine made by the faithful in the old days. The bishop fixes the amount of this stipend or tax, as it is called, and the priest must not ask, though he may accept, more. If he has leave to duplicate, or say two Masses, he must receive alms for one only, and if he asks another priest to say the Mass in his stead, he must hand over the whole alms. Many rules have been made, particularly of late, to prevent any appearance of traffic or avarice in this matter. Moreover, Benedict XIV points out that the rich have no unfair advantage over the poor because of their greater power to have Masses said for them. All souls are God's, and he can give the poor a special share in the general prayers of the Church, and supply their wants in a thousand ways. Riches and poverty are each, if rightly used, the means of salvation.

Names for Different Kinds of Masses.—(1) *High Mass*, in Latin *Missa solemnis*, is Mass with incense, music, the assistance

of deacon and sub-deacon, etc. It is usually sung, when there is a sufficient number of clergy, at least on Sundays and great feasts. Meratus quotes the term *Missa alta* from Rymer's "Fœdera," and the term seems to have been chiefly in use in England, though in Dutch and Flemish exactly the same term—namely, *Hoogmis*—is used, while the Germans have *Hochamt*. *Missa dominica* and *aurea* were mediæval names for Masses of special solemnity. Under solemn Masses, Meratus classes Pontifical Masses, celebrated by the bishop with his insignia, and Papal Masses, celebrated by the Pope on certain great feasts with special rites. The Pontifical Mass (the thing, not the name) is mentioned in a Roman "Ordo" supposed to belong to the former part of the eighth century. Meratus refers to a treatise on Papal Masses by Marcellus, Archbishop of Corcyra —"Rituum ecclesiasticorum sive S. Cærimoniarum SS. Romanæ Ecclesiæ."

(2) *Low Mass* (*Missa bassa* in French and English documents; *Basse Messe; Missa plana* in the "Cærimoniale Episc."). Mass said without music, the priest at least saying, and not singing, the Mass throughout.

(3) *Missa cantata* (also called *media*). A Mass sung, but without deacon and sub-deacon and the ceremonies proper to High Mass. In some parts the use of incense is permitted at such Masses.

(4) *Missa publica* (sometimes *communis*). A Mass to which the faithful of either sex are admitted. Hence Gregory the Great prohibited such Masses in monasteries. From the sixth century at least, nine o'clock was the time fixed for such Masses.

(5) *Missa privata* (also *secreta, familiaris, peculiaris*) is difficult of definition. Meratus gives one explanation which identifies it with Low Mass; another, according to which it is any Mass at which the priest alone communicates. It would be convenient if this word could be used, or if there were another word, to describe Mass which the priest says chiefly for his own devotion or that of his friends, and not to satisfy the wants of a parish, college, etc. In all private Masses the priest must have at least a server to represent the body of the faithful. Solitary Masses were once celebrated

by indulgence or privilege in monasteries. They are now strictly forbidden.

(6) *Missa parochialis:* the "Assembly of the faithful in which they offer public prayers and sacrifice by the ministry of their pastor, and learn from him what they should do and not do for their own salvation and the edification of their neighbors." The Council of Trent directs bishops to warn the faithful that they should hear Mass in their parish churches at least on Sundays and greater festivals.

(7) *Capitular Mass* is the High Mass on Sundays or festivals in collegiate churches.

(8) *Conventual Mass* is that which "the rectors of cathedral and collegiate churches are bound to have celebrated every day solemnly and with music after tierce." It must, as we have already seen, be applied for benefactors. It is also known among regulars as *Missa canonica, tertiæ, publica, communis, major.*

(9) *Votive Masses* are those which do not correspond with the office of the day, but are said by the choice (*votum*) of the priest. On all days, except Sundays, feasts of double and more than double rank, and certain other days specially excepted, a priest may say a Votive Mass of the Trinity, the Holy Ghost, the Blessed Virgin, the Angels, St. Peter and St. Paul, Mass for the dead, etc., instead of that assigned for the day.

(10) *Missa adventitia* or *manualis* is a Mass said for the intention of a person who gives an alms; and is opposed to a *Missa legata,* said for a special intention in consequence of a legacy or foundation.

(11) The *Missa præsanctificatorum* is really not a Mass at all. From very ancient times, as appears from the Council of Laodicea (canon 49) and the Synod in Trullo (canon 52), the Greek Church abstained from the celebration of Mass in the proper sense of the word during Lent, except on Saturdays and Sundays, and substituted for it the *Mass of the Presanctified,* in which the priest received as communion a Host previously consecrated. The Greeks still observe this ancient use, but the Latin Church contents herself

with abstaining from the celebration of Mass on Good Friday, the day on which Christ was offered as a bleeding Victim for our sins. This Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday is mentioned by Pope Innocent I in his letter to Decentius. The Blessed Sacrament is borne in procession from the chapel where it was placed the day before, while the choir sing the hymn "Vexilla Regis." The priest places the Host on the altar, the candles of which are now lighted. The Blessed Sacrament is elevated and adored while the wooden clapper is sounded; it is divided into three parts, one of which is put into a chalice containing wine and water. Finally the priest receives the portions of the Host which remain on the paten, and then takes the wine with the third portion of the Host. According to a Roman "Ordo" written about the year 800, the ceremony ended with the silent communion of the faithful; but the present discipline of the Church forbids communion to be given on Good Friday except in case of sickness.

Still more remote from the true idea of Mass is the *Missa sicca* —that is, "dry Mass"—a celebration without either consecration or communion, very common in the middle ages in the presence of the sick, at sea, and on other occasions when a true Mass could not be said. St. Louis of France used habitually to have this *Missa sicca* said at sea. Sometimes it was celebrated with all the ceremonies of High Mass. It is now fallen out of use, except that persons learning the ceremonies of Mass sometimes say a *Missa sicca* before ordination. A real Mass is sometimes said at sea. Gavantus disapproves the practice, because of the danger that the chalice may be overturned.[1] Benedict XIV [2] holds that Mass cannot be said at sea, even if there seems to be no danger of irreverence, without an apostolic indult.

THE PASSION AND DEATH OF JESUS IN THE MASS

The priest going to the altar represents Christ going to Mount Olivet.

[1] Pars I. tit. xx. f.

[2] De Missa, lib. iii. cap. 6, § 11.

Commencing Mass represents Christ beginning to pray.

Saying the Confiteor represents Christ falling down and sweating blood.

Going up and kissing the altar represents Christ being betrayed by Judas with a kiss.

Going to the Epistle side represents Christ being captured, bound and taken to Annas.

Reading the Introit represents Christ being falsely accused by Annas and blasphemed.

Going to the middle of the altar and saying the Kyrie Eleison represents Christ being brought to Caiaphas and there three times denied by Peter.

Saying the *Dominus Vobiscum* represents Christ looking at Peter and converting him.

Reading the Epistle represents Christ being brought to Pilate.

Saying the *Munda cor meum* represents Christ being taken to Herod and mocked.

Reading the Gospel represents Christ being taken to Pilate and again mocked.

Uncovering the chalice represents Christ being shamefully exposed.

Offering the bread and wine represents Christ being cruelly scourged.

Covering the chalice represents Christ being crowned with thorns.

Washing his hands represents Christ being declared innocent by Pilate.

Saying the *Orate Fratres* represents Christ being shown by Pilate to the people with the words *Ecce Homo.*

Praying in a low voice represents Christ being mocked and spit upon.

Saying the Preface and the Sanctus represents Christ being taken instead of Barabbas and condemned to crucifixion.

Making the memento for the living represents Christ carrying the cross to Mount Calvary.

Continuing to pray in a low voice represents Christ meeting his Mother.

Blessing the bread and wine represents Christ being nailed to the cross.

Elevating the Host represents Christ being raised on the cross.

Elevating the chalice represents Christ shedding blood from the five wounds.

Praying in a low voice represents Christ seeing his afflicted Mother at the cross.

Saying aloud *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* represents Christ praying on the cross for men.

Saying aloud the *Pater Noster* represents Christ saying the seven words on the cross.

Breaking and separating the Host represents Christ giving up his spirit.

Letting a portion of the Host fall into the chalice represents his soul going to Limbo.

Saying the *Agnus Dei* represents Christ being acknowledged on the cross as the Son of God by many bystanders.

Administering Holy Communion represents Christ being laid in the sepulchre.

Cleansing the chalice represents Christ being anointed by pure women.

Preparing the chalice again represents Christ arising from the dead.

Saying the *Dominus Vobiscum* represents Christ appearing to his Mother and the disciples.

Saying the last prayers represents Christ teaching for forty days.

Saying the last *Dominus Vobiscum* represents Christ taking leave of his disciples and ascending to heaven.

Giving the Benediction to the people represents Christ sending down the Holy Ghost.

Saying the *Ite Missa est* represents Christ sending the apostles into all parts of the world to preach the Gospel.

THE HIDDEN TREASURE OF THE HOLY MASS[1]

It requires great patience to endure the language of some worldlings whom we hear every day saying: "It is only a Mass more or less." "It is so hard to be obliged to hear Mass on holidays." "The Mass of that priest is as long as one in Holy Week; when I see him go to the altar, I always hurry out of church." He who speaks thus shows he has little or no esteem for the most holy sacrifice. Do you know what the holy sacrifice is? It is the sum of Christianity, the soul of faith, the centre of the Catholic religion, the grand object of all her rites, her ceremonies, and her sacraments: it is, in a word, the summary of all that is good and beautiful in the Church of God. Now, let me beseech you who read these pages to ponder seriously on what I say in the following instructions.

It is an absolute certainty that all religions that ever existed from the beginning of the world had a sacrifice as an essential part of the worship they offered to God. But as their religions were either vain or imperfect, so were their sacrifices vain and imperfect. Vainest of all vain things were the sacrifices of the idolaters; nor need we prove this truth of Holy Writ. Those of the Hebrews, although they professed the true religion, are justly called by St. Paul "weak and poor elements,"[2] because they could not forgive sin nor confer grace. The one great sacrifice of our holy religion, the Holy Mass alone, is holy, perfect, and in every respect complete: for by it the faithful render the highest honor to God, and at the same time acknowledge their own nothingness and the supreme dominion he has over all his creatures.

The royal Prophet called this sacrifice the "sacrifice of justice,"[3] as it contains the Just One himself, or rather the Saint of saints; and because it sanctifies souls by the infusion of divine grace,

[1] This admirable discourse, framed in sentences so simple as to be suited to the understanding of the youngest reader, is taken from the Works of St. Leonard of Port Maurice.

[2] Gal. iv. 9. [3] Psalm iv. 5.

and replenishes them with the richest gifts of heaven. As it is, then, a sacrifice so holy and so excellent, we will consider briefly some of the great treasures contained in this divine gift. I say *some* of these treasures, as it would be impossible for us to enumerate or explain them all.

The first question that suggests itself to us regarding the most holy sacrifice of the Mass is: In what does its principal excellence consist? It consists in this—namely, that it is essentially the same, yea, the very same, sacrifice that was offered on the cross of Calvary, the only difference being that the sacrifice of the cross was bloody and made once for all, and did then satisfy fully for all the sins of the world. The sacrifice of the altar, however, is an unbloody sacrifice which can be repeated throughout all ages, and was instituted in order to apply to each of us the universal atonement which Christ made for us on Calvary.

In a word: the bloody sacrifice was the instrument of redemption, and the unbloody sacrifice puts us in possession of it; the one opened to us the treasury of the merits of Christ our Lord, and the other gives us the practical use of that never-failing treasury. Hence we must ever bear in mind that in the Mass there is made not a mere representation nor a simple commemoration of the passion and death of the Redeemer, but in a certain, true sense there is offered the very same most holy sacrifice that was offered on Calvary.

It may, then, be said with all truth that our Redeemer returns to die mystically for us, although he can die no more really; at one and the same time, he is alive and as it were slain again, according to that passage of the Apocalypse, "I saw a Lamb standing as it were slain." On Christmas Day the Church represents the birth of our Lord, but our Lord is not then born. At Ascension and Whitsuntide the Church again recalls to mind the ascent of our Lord to heaven, and the coming of the Holy Ghost on the apostles and disciples; still, it is not true that as each of these festivals returns, the Lord ascends to heaven, or that the Holy Ghost visibly descends to earth.

But the same cannot be said of the mystery of the holy sacrifice of the Mass, for here there is made no simple representation of a past event, but the very same sacrifice which was offered on the cross is here offered, though in an unbloody manner. That same Body, that same Blood, that same Jesus who then offered himself on Calvary, now offers himself in the most holy sacrifice of the Mass. "The work of our redemption," says the Church, "is here effected or continued." Yes, indeed; in the Mass is continuously offered the same sacrifice that was offered on the cross. O awful, solemn, and wonderful work of God!

Now tell me sincerely, when you go to the church to hear Mass, do you clearly realize that you are approaching Calvary, to be present at the death of your Redeemer? If this truth sank deeply into your heart, would you dare to enter the holy place with such a distracting air, or with such unbecoming apparel? If Magdalen had gone to Calvary, to the foot of the cross, dressed out, perfumed, and adorned as in the time of her sinful life, what would have been said of her? But what ought to be said if you profane these holy rites of the dread sacrifice with careless behavior or sacrilegious thoughts, words, or deeds?

Iniquity is detested by God at all times and in all places; but the sins committed under the shadow of the altar bring down the signal chastisement of God, who says in Holy Writ, "Cursed be he who doth the work of the Lord deceitfully." Think seriously on this, while I continue to show you other marvels and glories of this most precious treasure.

It seems to me impossible for any religious rite to have a more excellent prerogative than this we have now considered; but its eminence is still more enhanced by having for its priest none other than God himself, Jesus Christ, the God-Man. In this great sacrifice three things should never be forgotten: the Priest who offers, the Victim offered, and the majesty of him to whom the offering is made. Now, reflect on the wonderful glory of the holy sacrifice, and let each of these three considerations be deeply impressed on your soul. The Priest who offers the Victim is the same Man-

God, Christ Jesus; nor is the sacrifice offered to any other than to God.

Revive, then, your faith, and recognize as the celebrant not so much the visible priest whom we see at the altar, as our Lord Jesus Christ himself. He is the primary Offerer not only because he has instituted this holy sacrifice, and has given to it all its efficacy, through his merits, but also because in each Mass he himself, for love of us, deigns to change the bread and wine into his most holy Body and most precious Blood. Behold, then, the grandest privilege of the most holy sacrifice, to have for priest the God-Man; and when you see the celebrant at the altar, remember that his greatest dignity consists in being the minister of this invisible and eternal Priest, our Divine Redeemer.

Hence it follows that the sacrifice itself cannot cease to be agreeable to God, no matter what may be the unworthiness of the priest who celebrates, since the principal Offerer is Christ our Lord, and the priest is merely his minister. In the same way a person who gives alms by the hands of a servant is called in all truth the giver; and even though his servant may be sinful or wicked, when the master is good the alms do not fail to have their reward. Blessed, then, be God, who hath bestowed on us a most holy Priest, who offers to the Eternal Father this divine sacrifice not only in every place—as the Catholic religion is now propagated in all the countries of the world—but every day, and even every hour, since the sun rises for others when it sets for us.

At every hour, then, of the day and night this most holy Priest offers to his Father his Blood, his Soul, and his entire Self for us. All this he does as often as the holy sacrifice is celebrated in the whole world. O happy should we be if we could assist at all these Masses! O immense treasure! O mine of inexhaustible wealth, thus possessed by us in the Church of God! What an ocean of graces in this life, what a fund of glory in the next, would not the devout attendance at this most holy sacrifice procure for us!

But why do I use the word *attendance?* For those who hear

Mass not only fulfil the office of attendants at it, but they are likewise offerers, and have a right to the title of priests, according to the Apocalypse. "Thou hast made us to our God a kingdom and priests." The celebrant is, as it were, the public minister of the Church in general, and at the same time a mediator for all the faithful, and particularly for those who assist at Mass, with the invisible Priest who is Christ; together with Christ, he offers to the Eternal Father, both in behalf of all mankind and of himself, the great price of human redemption.

But the celebrant is not alone in this august function, since all those who assist at Mass unite with him in offering the holy sacrifice; and therefore he turns to the people and says, "Pray, brethren, that your sacrifice and mine may be acceptable to God," in order that we may understand that, although he acts the part of principal minister, all those who are present make the great offering with him.

Hence, when you assist at Mass you perform in a certain manner the office of priest. Will you, then, ever again dare to hear Mass, sitting, whispering, looking here and there, perhaps even sleeping, or will you content yourself with reciting some vocal prayers, and entirely ignoring the tremendous office of priest which you are exercising? Alas! I cannot refrain from crying out, "O dull and senseless world, that will not understand such sublime mysteries!"

How is it possible any one can remain with a mind distracted and a heart dissipated, at a time when the holy angels fall down in lowly adoration, trembling and amazed at the contemplation of such a stupendous work of Divine Goodness?

You are astonished, perhaps, to hear me call the Mass a stupendous work. But what tongue, human or angelic, can ever describe a power so immeasurable as that exercised by the priest at Mass? And who could have ever imagined that the voice of man, which of itself is not able to raise a straw from the ground, should be endowed with a power so stupendous as to bring the Son of God from heaven to earth?

This power far exceeds that which would be required to move mountains, to dry up seas, or to govern the movements of the heavenly bodies—nay, more, it rivals in a certain way that first *fiat* by which God created all things out of nothing; and in some manner it would seem to surpass that other *fiat* with which the Blessed Virgin drew down to her bosom the Eternal Word.

The blessed John Buono of Mantua gave a very beautiful illustration of this to his companion, a hermit, who was unable to imagine how the words of a priest could be endowed with such a tremendous power as to be able to change the substance of bread into the Body of Jesus Christ, and the substance of wine into his Blood. This unfortunate hermit had, moreover, unhappily consented to these doubts which the devil suggested. The holy servant of God, perceiving the poor sinful man's error, led him to a fountain, from which he drew a vessel of water and gave it to him to drink. After he had drunk he protested that he never before, during his whole life, had tasted such delicious wine.

Then blessed John Buono said to him, "Dear brother, does not this convince you of the marvellous truth of which you doubt? If through me, a miserable creature, water is changed into wine by Divine Power, how much more ought you to believe that, by virtue of the words pronounced by the priest, which are the words of God, the bread and wine are converted into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ? And who shall dare to limit the power of God Almighty?" This so effectually enlightened the mind of the hermit, that, banishing every doubt from his mind, he did great penance for his sins.

Let us have but a lively faith, and it will convince us that the unspeakable excellences contained in this adorable sacrifice are without number; nor shall we then be surprised to see the miracle repeated thousands and thousands of times, at every hour, and in every place. For the sacred humanity of Jesus Christ enjoys a sort of ubiquity, not granted to other bodies, but bestowed on him through the merits of his life sacrificed to the will of his Father.

This multiplied existence of our Lord in the most holy sacra-

ment was explained to an unbelieving Jew by an ignorant poor woman. The Jew was standing in the public street where there was a great crowd, and among them this poor woman, and at the moment a priest approached carrying the Blessed Sacrament to a sick person. All the people knelt and adored the Most Blessed Sacrament as it passed; but the Jew alone moved not, nor showed any sign of reverence.

This being seen by the poor woman, she cried out to the Jew, "O miserable wretch, why do you not show reverence to the true God present in the most holy sacrament?"

"What true God?" answered the Jew; "if the true God were there, it would follow that there are many Gods, as you say there is one on each of your altars during Mass."

The woman immediately took a sieve and placing it between the Jew's eyes and the sun, told him to look at the rays which shone through the apertures.

When he had done so, she said to him, "Tell me now, Jew, are there many suns, or only one, passing through the openings in this sieve?" The Jew answering that there was but one sun, "Then," replied the woman, "why do you wonder if the God-Man, veiled in the sacrament, though one, individual, and unchanged, should, through excess of love for us, give himself, really and truly present, on different altars at the same time?"

This simple illustration convinced the unbelieving Jew, and forced him to acknowledge this great truth of our holy faith. O holy faith! a single ray of thy divine light is sufficient to make the most illiterate to answer the captious questions of the enemies of religion. Who shall ever dare to assign limits to the almighty power of God? St. Teresa had such a conception of the omnipotence of God that she used to say, "The more incomprehensible, deep, and abstruse the mysteries of our holy faith are to our understanding, the firmer and more devoutly ought we to believe them."

She was, indeed, justified in expressing herself thus, knowing that God Almighty can perform works infinitely greater than our limited intelligences can comprehend. Revive, then, your faith,

and acknowledge that this divine sacrifice is the miracle of miracles, the marvel of marvels, and that its greatest excellence consists in being incomprehensible to our limited understandings. Amazed at such wonderful goodness of God, never cease repeating, "O inestimable treasure! treasure of love, beyond all human comprehension!"

This treasure of the Holy Mass revives our hopes, and encourages us to look for everlasting glory in that paradise which cannot be lost except through our own folly and sinfulness. If, therefore, it is the duty of the Christian to centre his heart's affections on our altars, and to perfume them with incense and flowers of the sweetest odor, it is still more necessary to honor them with purity and modesty, since they are the mercy-seats from which we derive all good.

And you, O priests, join your hands, and, with hearts thrilling with holy love, gratefully thank the Eternal Father for having placed you in the sweet necessity of often offering to him this heavenly Victim; and, still more, let us thank him for the countless blessings we can draw from it, if we be but faithful, not only in offering it, but in offering it for the sublime ends for which he bestowed a treasure so precious.

If, then, you set little value on the most holy sacrifice, it is a certain sign that you fail to appreciate the vast gain it bestows on the living and the dead, on the just and sinners, during life and at the hour of death; nay, even after death itself. Imagine, then, you are the debtor of the Gospel, who, overwhelmed by the heavy debt of ten thousand talents, and being commanded to pay, excused himself and piteously pleaded for time to satisfy his obligations. "Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all."

This you should also do, who owe not only one but many debts to the bank of Divine Justice. You ought to humble yourself, and beg as much time as is needed for hearing Holy Mass, and be sure you will thus fully satisfy all your obligations and pay all your debts to Divine Justice. The Angelic Doctor[1] teaches

[1] St. Thomas Aquinas,

us what these debts are which each one owes to God; they are specially four, and each of them is infinite.

The first is to praise and honor the infinite majesty of God, which is infinitely worthy of all the praise and honor the creature can give him.

The second is to satisfy for the many sins committed against his infinite majesty.

The third is to thank him for the many favors received from him.

The fourth is to supplicate him as the Giver of all good gifts.

Now, how can we, miserable creatures, who depend on God for the very air we breathe, be able to repay him for debts so numerous and so weighty? Let me at once, therefore, show you the easiest way of doing so; and let me add that this way of satisfying Divine Justice is one that must console you and me and the world.

Let us take care to attend with all possible devotion as many Masses as we can; and let us strive to have them celebrated frequently for our intention; and thus, were our debts as countless as the sands on the sea-shore, and as weighty as they can be, there is not the least doubt but that we shall be able to discharge them all fully and adequately, by the treasury we can draw from the most holy sacrifice of the Mass.

But in order that you may have a fuller knowledge of each of these your debts, we shall explain them one by one; and you will then find a subject of great consolation in considering the inexhaustible wealth you possess for their payment in such a rich mine, from which you can draw on all occasions when you assist at Holy Mass.

The first debt which we owe to God is the duty of rendering him supreme honor. It is a precept of the natural law that every inferior ought to show homage to his superior; and the greater his dignity, the greater also ought to be the homage due to him. Hence it follows that, as God is infinitely great, we ought to return him a homage worthy of his infinite goodness. But

where can we miserable creatures find any offering worthy of his infinite grandeur?

Seek as you may among all the creatures of the universe, you will not find one worthy of God. Ah, no; an offering worthy of God must be God himself. And he who is seated on the throne of his own infinite greatness—he it is who must descend and lay himself as a Victim on our altars, in order that our homage may perfectly correspond with the eminence of his infinite majesty.

This is what takes place in Holy Mass. Almighty God is here honored as he deserves, because he is honored by God himself. Jesus Christ, the Man-God, places himself as our Victim on the altar, and adores the Most Holy Trinity with an act of incomprehensible submission, such as no one else can offer; for all the offerings of all creatures, compared to this self-humiliation of our Divine Redeemer, are as the feeble glimmering of the stars before the meridian splendors of the sun. You wonder, perhaps, at this, but you are wrong; for our good Jesus is not only Man, but true and omnipotent God, and by humbling himself on the altar he offers to the Most Holy Trinity an infinite homage: so that we who unite with him in offering this great sacrifice are thus enabled to present to God a homage and honor which is also infinite.

O stupendous truth! Let us repeat it over and over again, since it can never be too deeply engraven on our memories: even we, by hearing Holy Mass with devotion, can render God an honor and homage that is infinite. Be now confounded for very wonder, reflecting on this great truth, that a soul assisting devoutly at Holy Mass can give God more honor than that which all the angels and saints together can render him with all their adorations. For, after all, they, like ourselves, are mere creatures, and their homage is therefore limited and finite; whereas in the Mass, Jesus humbles himself—a humiliation which is infinite in value and merit; and consequently the homage and honor which we render through him in the Mass is a homage and honor which is infinite.

And since this grand truth cannot be doubted, ought we not to congratulate ourselves to be able to satisfy this first debt by

assisting worthily at the most holy sacrifice of the Mass? O blind world! when will you open your eyes to understand a truth so grand and so important, and which so concerns your welfare? And yet, alas, you have the folly to say, "A Mass more or less matters little." O dreadful blindness!

Our second debt or obligation, by which we are bound toward God, is to satisfy his justice for our numberless and enormous sins. O what a measureless debt is this! One single mortal sin outweighs in the scale of Divine Justice all the good works of all the martyrs and of all the saints who have ever existed, who live now, or who will live to the end of time. And yet, by means of the most holy sacrifice of the Mass, on account of its intrinsic value and holiness, we are enabled to make a complete and adequate satisfaction for all the sins we have ever committed.

But in order that you may clearly understand how much you are indebted to Jesus Christ, consider seriously what I now say to you. Although he is the very person who has been offended and outraged by our sins, yet, not content with having satisfied Divine Justice for us on Calvary, he has given and continuously gives us the same means of satisfying for our sins, in the most holy sacrifice of the Mass.

For there is renewed in the Mass that offering which Jesus Christ had already made on the cross to the Eternal Father for the sins of the whole world—that same Divine Blood which he poured out for the ransom of the entire human race; and the Mass is thus specially applied to each and every one of us, as it is offered for the sins of him who celebrates and for those who assist at so tremendous a sacrifice.

But here I must not be understood to say that the Mass by any means cancels our sins immediately by itself, as the sacrament of Penance does; but it cancels them mediately by obtaining for us various aids, such as interior impulses, holy inspirations, and actual grace, all of which conduce to a true repentance for our sins, either during Mass or at some other fitting time. For this reason, no one but God himself can know how many souls rise out

of the slough of sin through the extraordinary aid they receive from the most holy sacrifice.

Here I must add that although the Mass cannot aid a person in mortal sin by way of propitiation, it, however, helps him by way of supplication; hence all sinners ought to hear as many Masses as possible, in order that they may obtain the grace of conversion. To souls, however, who live in grace, it gives a wonderful strength, enabling them to remain in their happy state.

But you will now, perhaps, say to me: "It is, then, sufficient to hear a single Mass, or cause one Mass to be celebrated, to get rid of all those weighty debts due to God on account of the many sins we have committed; because, the Mass being of infinite value, we can thereby render to God an infinite satisfaction." Do not, I beseech you, make such a hasty conclusion. The Mass, it is true, is of infinite value in itself, but Almighty God accepts it only in a finite and limited manner, and in accordance with the greater or less perfection in the dispositions of him who celebrates, for whom it is offered, or who assists at the sacrifice.

"Whose faith and devotion are known to thee," says Holy Church, in the Canon of the Mass. The Church thus teaches us, by these words of the Canon, what great divines hold: "that the greater or less satisfaction applied in our behalf by the sacrifice is determined by the greater or less dispositions of the celebrant or the assistants." Consider, then, the folly of those who wish and seek for quickly celebrated Masses; and, what is worse, assist at them with little or no devotion. Consider with shame the culpable indifference of those who never have Masses celebrated for their spiritual and temporal welfare.

It is certain, according to St. Thomas, that all sacrifices, as sacrifices, are equal in dignity; but they are not equal as regards the effects that flow from them; hence the greater the actual or habitual piety of the celebrant, the greater also will be the fruit of the application of the Mass; so that to make no distinction in this matter is to be indifferent whether the net you fish with be small or large. The same can be said of those who assist at Mass.

Although I most earnestly exhort you to hear as many Masses as you can, I yet feel bound to say that you must have more regard for the devotion in hearing than for the number heard. If you have more devotion in a single Mass than another man has in fifty, you will give more honor to God in that single Mass, and you will derive more benefit from it, in the way called *ex opere operato*, than the other will from his fifty. "In satisfaction," says St. Thomas, "the disposition of the person offering is more regarded than the quantity of the oblation."

It is indeed true that, as a grave author asserts, in certain cases a single Mass heard with extraordinary fervor and devotion may satisfy the justice of God for all the transgressions of a great sinner. And this is quite in harmony with what the Council of Trent teaches, namely: "That in the offering of this holy sacrifice, God grants the gift of repentance, and then by means of this true repentance he pardons sins the most grave and enormous." Yet, notwithstanding all this, since neither the interior dispositions with which you assist at Mass are manifest to yourself, nor the satisfaction which corresponds thereto, you ought to strive to hear as many Masses as you can, and with all the devotion possible, that you may more surely gain these great fruits of the most holy sacrifice.

Blessed shall you be if you cherish a great confidence in the loving mercy of God, which shines forth so wonderfully in this most holy sacrifice. Thrice happy, above all, shall you be if you assist as often as possible, with a lively faith and devout recollection, at the holy sacrifice; for I am certain, if you do this with perseverance, you may have secure hope of escaping purgatory and going straight to the bosom of God forever in heaven. Go, then, to Mass—go regularly to Mass—and never let such scandalous words escape you as: "A Mass more or less is of little consequence."

Our third debt is one of gratitude for the countless benefits which our most loving God has bestowed on us. Place together all the gifts and all the graces you have received from God; so

many gifts of nature and grace, body, soul, senses, faculties and health, and life itself; add to all these the very life of his Son Jesus Christ, and the death that he suffered for love of us; and does not all this increase a thousandfold the debt you owe to God? But how shall we ever be sufficiently able to thank him?

If the law of gratitude is observed by the wild beasts, whose fierce nature is often changed into gentleness toward their benefactors, how much more ought it not to be observed by man, gifted as he is with reason and so nobly endowed by the divine liberality? But, unhappily, our poverty is so great that we have no means of making an adequate return for the least of these countless favors; as the very least of them, coming from the hand of a Majesty so grand, and accompanied as it is by an infinite love, acquires an infinite value and obliges us to an infinite correspondence in the way of reverence and love.

O poor and wretched creatures that we are! If we cannot repay a single benefit, how can we ever be able to pay so many and so countless? Then we are thus placed in the cruel necessity of living and dying ungrateful to our Supreme Benefactor.

But, thank God, this shall not be, for the manner of showing our gratitude to that good Benefactor, and of fully requiting him for all his favors, is taught us by the royal Prophet, who, led by divine inspiration, clearly indicates that nothing save the Holy Mass can render due thanks to God.

"What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits to me?" says this holy king; and then, answering himself, he continues: "I will take the cup of salvation" (or, according to another version, "I will raise on high the chalice of the Lord"); that is, "I will offer a sacrifice most acceptable to him, and with this alone I shall satisfy the debt of so many and such favors."

Remember, also, that the sacrifice was instituted by our Redeemer principally for this end—that is, to acknowledge the divine bounty and as a thank-offering to his goodness. Hence it is called the *Eucharistic* Sacrifice, and the *Eucharist* or *Thank-offering*. He himself gave us the example when, at the Last Supper, before

consecration in that first Mass, he raised his eyes to heaven, and gave thanks to his heavenly Father.

O divine thanksgiving, which discovers to us the sublime end for which this tremendous sacrifice was instituted, and which invites us to conform ourselves to our Head; so that at every Mass at which we assist we may know how to make good use of so great a treasure, by offering it in gratitude to our Supreme Benefactor. And that we may perform this great act with greater zeal and devotion, let us always remember that all paradise, the Blessed Virgin and the angels and saints, rejoice when we offer this our tribute of thanks to so great a King.

We read in the history of the venerable Sister Francesca Farnese, that her whole life was troubled with a thousand anxieties as to how she could return love for love to God. She often lamented to see herself covered over from head to foot with divine blessings, without knowing how to return adequate thanks to her Lord for the least of these benefits bestowed on her. On one of these occasions, the Blessed Virgin appeared to Francesca, and placed the heavenly Babe, her Divine Son, in Francesca's arms. "Take him," she said, "for he is yours; and with him alone you will easily discharge all your obligations to his Father."

O thrice blessed Mass, which places the Son of God not only in our arms, but also in our heart! A little Child has been given to us, that we may be able to do with him—him alone—what would be otherwise impossible to our human weakness; as most assuredly with him we can fully and adequately discharge the debt of gratitude we owe to Almighty God. Yea, in the Holy Mass, in a certain way, we give to God something more than what he has bestowed on us—not in reality, of course, but in appearance; since once only the Eternal Father has given us his Divine Son in the incarnation, while we give him back to him times without number in the most holy sacrifice.

Thus it seems we have the advantage, not indeed in the quality of the gift, since nothing greater than the Son of God could have been given us, but in appearance, in returning to him so often

and so continuously the self-same Gift. O great God! O most loving God! Would that we had tongues infinite in number and power to return thee infinite thanks for so great a treasure! If hitherto it has lain a treasure hidden from you, now that you have begun to know its surpassing value, can you fail to exclaim over and over again, "O treasure of treasures! O treasure beyond all price!"

But the infinite benefit of Holy Mass does not end here; for it enables us also to pay the fourth debt due to God. I have already said that this debt obliges us to supplicate him and to ask new graces of him. You know full well that your necessities of soul and body are grievous and manifold; and you feel every moment of your existence how necessary it is to have recourse to him, as he alone is the chief source, the beginning and the end of all your good, whether temporal or eternal. On the other hand, what heart can you have to ask for his favors, seeing the utter ingratitude which you have shown him for the many graces already bestowed on you?

Have you not even turned the very graces he gave you into offences against him? But still, let not your heart lose courage; for if you have not deserved these graces, our good Jesus has deserved them for you. In fact, for this end he has become a pacifying Victim—a supplicatory sacrifice—to obtain from the Eternal Father all things you may require.

In the Holy Mass our dear and beloved Jesus, who is our great High Priest, recommends our cause to his Father, prays for us, and becomes himself our Advocate. If we knew that the Blessed Virgin was uniting with us in prayer to the Eternal Father, to obtain the graces we desired, what confidence we should have of being heard! What hope, then, what confidence should we not have, when we know that, in the Mass, Jesus himself prays for us, offers his most precious Blood to the Eternal Father for us, and makes himself our Advocate. O thrice blessed Mass, thou art the mine of all our good!

But we must dig deeper into this mine in order to discover

more of the vast treasures it contains. O what priceless gems of grace and virtue are there! O what precious gifts the Holy Mass draws down from heaven! In the first place, it calls down all spiritual graces, all the goods of the soul, such as true sorrow and repentance for sin, victory over temptations, no matter of what kind, whether from external trials, bad companions, and the infernal spirits, or those arising from the internal rebellion of our fallen nature. Yes, the Holy Mass obtains for us all those aids of grace which we need to rise from the mire of sin, to stand erect, and to walk forward in the ways of God.

It likewise brings us innumerable holy inspirations and internal impulses, which dispose us to shake off tepidity, and excite us to work out our salvation with greater fervor, with a more prompt will, and with a purer and more meritorious intention. These again contain an inestimable treasure, as they are the most efficacious means to obtain from God the grace of final perseverance—on which depends our eternal salvation—and a moral certainty of eternal bliss, as much as that certainty is vouchsafed to man during his mortal pilgrimage.

Furthermore, it calls down temporal blessings, inasmuch as they are conducive to the salvation of the soul; such as health of body, abundance, peace, and the exclusion of the contrary evils, such as pestilences, earthquakes, wars, famines, persecutions, hatreds, calumnies, and injuries of every sort. In a word, the Holy Mass delivers us from all evil and enriches us with every good.

Truly, then, the Mass is the golden key of paradise; and since the Eternal Father has given us this key, which of all his boundless treasures can he refuse us? He that spared not even his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how hath he not also with him given us all things?

We can now easily understand why a holy priest used to say: "No matter how great the graces I ask of God for myself or others as often as I celebrate Mass, they are nothing compared to the offering I make him." He, indeed, reasoned justly when he added: "All the favors that I ask of God, when celebrating

Holy Mass, are created and finite things; whereas the gifts I offer to him are uncreated and infinite, and so, to balance the account, I become the creditor and he the debtor." This good priest by no means wished to deny that the power of offering the gift, as well as the gift itself, came first from God; but, putting it thus, he asked great graces in the holy sacrifice, and received still greater.

And you—why do you not realize all this? Why is it you do not ask great graces at this favorable time? I earnestly advise and exhort you to ask God, in every Mass, the grace to become a saint. Do you think I advise you to ask too much? Well, I tell you it is not too much. Has not our good and loving Master promised us in the Gospel that for a cup of cold water, given in his name, he will bestow the kingdom of heaven? How, then, could he refuse us a hundred heavens, were there so many, in return for the Blood of his beloved Son, offered to him on the altar?

How can you, therefore, doubt that he will give you every virtue, and all the perfections required to make you a saint, and a great saint in heaven? O blessed Mass! Let your heart's desires, then, be multiplied a thousandfold, and ask as much as you will; remembering always that you are asking of God, who cannot grow poor by giving, and, therefore, the more you ask, the more will he give you.

St. Bernard is emphatic on this truth: "More is gained," he says, "by a single Mass, than by distributing all your goods to the poor, or going on pilgrimages to all the most holy shrines in the world." O boundless riches of Holy Mass! Let this truth sink deeply into your heart. By hearing or celebrating Holy Mass, considered in itself and in its intrinsic worth, you can gain more merit before God than by giving all your goods to the poor, or by going as a pilgrim through the entire world, or by visiting with the utmost devotion the famous sanctuaries of Rome, of Compostella, or Loreto, Jerusalem, and all others throughout the universe.

This grand truth clearly follows from the doctrine laid down by St. Thomas, the Angelic Doctor, who says: "In each Mass are

contained all the fruits, all the graces, yea, all those immense treasures which the Son of God poured out so abundantly upon the Church, his Spouse, in the bloody sacrifice of the cross."

Now, pause awhile; close this book; read no further at present, but sum up in your mind all the wonderful blessings of Holy Mass; weigh them well in silence; and then can you find any difficulty in believing that one Mass—viewed in its own intrinsic worth and value—is of such efficacy that, according to the doctors of the Church, it might have sufficed to obtain the salvation of the whole human race?

Let us suppose that our Lord Jesus Christ had not suffered at all on Calvary, and that, instead of the bloody sacrifice of the cross, he had solely instituted the Mass for our redemption, and with an express precept that it should be celebrated only once in the entire world. Well, now, had God been pleased to act thus, that single Mass, celebrated by the poorest priest on earth, would suffice —considered in its intrinsic value—to obtain the conversion of all men. Yes, a single Mass—taking the case we have supposed—would be sufficient to convert all the Mohammedans, infidels, schismatics, heretics, and bad Christians throughout the world.

At the same time it would close the gates of hell and empty purgatory of all the souls suffering therein. But, alas! we, unhappy creatures, thoughtless children of Adam, by our tepidity, our want of devotion, and perhaps by our sins and iniquities committed during Mass—we narrow its unbounded extent, and we render its infinite treasures of no value.

Would that I could ascend to the summit of the highest mountain and there cry aloud, so that the whole world might hear me: O foolish people, wretched inhabitants of the earth, what are you doing? Why do you not run to the churches to assist at every Mass celebrated therein? Why not imitate the holy angels, who, according to St. Chrysostom, descend in legions during Holy Mass and stand before the altar, covered with wings of reverence and holy awe, waiting there during the time of the august Sacrifice, in order to intercede more efficaciously for us, well knowing that this is the

most fitting time, the very moment we require to obtain every blessing from Heaven?

Are you not now filled with shame and confusion when you remember how little value you have hitherto set on Holy Mass? But what shall I say of you if you are one of those who have said: "A Mass more, or a Mass less, is of little importance!"

And before concluding this instruction, let me remind you that it was not by mere accident I told you that a single Mass, as far as its intrinsic value is concerned, is sufficient to empty purgatory of all the souls who are being purified therein, and to lead them to the bosom of God in paradise. For this divine sacrifice not only aids the souls of the dead in a propitiatory and satisfactory manner for the temporal punishment due to their sins, but it also avails them in a supplicatory manner—that is, it obtains for them their entire deliverance from purgatory.

Hence the custom of Holy Church, which not only offers the Mass for the souls in purgatory, but prays for their entire deliverance. In order, then, that you may be excited to compassion for these holy souls shut out for a time from the Beatific Vision, let me remind you of the words of St. Gregory the Great, who, in his "Dialogues," says: "The flames of purgatory are, as it were, the instrument of Divine Justice, operating with such terrible power as to render the agony of the souls therein detained insufferable. These pains," continues the saint, "far exceed all the tribulations or martyrdoms that can be witnessed, felt, or even imagined in this life."[1]

But still more excruciating than all this is the pain of loss; because, being deprived of the beautiful vision of God, as the Angelic Doctor says, "They experience an indescribable agony and a fierce and burning thirst to behold the Supreme Good, all which is denied to their unceasing yearnings." Here, now, enter into your own heart and realize the following truth: If you should at any time see your father and mother on the point of being drowned, and if you could save them by merely stretching out your hand,

[1] Dialogues, 1, 4, 6, 131.

would you not feel yourself bound by the law of charity and of justice to stretch forth that hand to rescue them?

How, then, can you behold with the eyes of faith so many poor souls—perhaps your nearest and dearest friends—in a sea of fire, and yet remain so heartless as not to endure the trifling inconvenience of assisting with devotion at one Mass for their release or the alleviation of their agonies? What an unfeeling heart is yours! Surely you cannot doubt that even a single Mass can bring exceeding great comfort to these poor souls.

Examples without end prove that charity or holy compassion for the poor souls will redound to your own welfare; but I will confine myself to one well authenticated in the life of St. Peter Damian. This holy servant of God, left an orphan at a tender age, was taken into the house of one of his brothers, who treated him cruelly, making him go barefoot and in rags, and causing him to endure the privations and sufferings of a mendicant. It happened that one day he found a small sum of money on the road. He seemed to himself to have found a treasure.

But how was he to spend it? His miserable state—so poor and so friendless—suggested many ways; but after thinking the matter over and over again, he finally resolved to give it to a priest to celebrate Mass for the holy souls in purgatory. From that time forward his fortune was changed. He was adopted by another brother of an amiable disposition, who took him into his house, treated him as his own child, clothed him, and sent him to school, whence he came forth a great man and a great saint, an ornament to the College of Cardinals, and one of the most illustrious pillars of the Church.

Now you see how in a single Mass, obtained at a slight personal inconvenience, all the happiness of this great saint and doctor of the Church had its origin. O Most Holy Mass! which at the same time assists the living and the dead! O Most Holy Sacrifice, replete with blessings for time and for eternity!

You must bear in mind that the souls in purgatory are so grateful to their benefactors that, when once in heaven, they become

their advocates. They never cease to intercede for their benefactors until they see them in eternal glory.

I earnestly implore you who read this not to close until you have made a firm resolution of henceforth employing all possible diligence in assisting at Mass, and of causing as many Masses to be celebrated as your means permit, not only for the souls in purgatory, but also for your own soul and the souls of your friends and benefactors. Two motives should induce you to do this.

First, that you may obtain the blessing of a holy death, for it is the opinion of holy and learned divines that there is no more powerful or efficacious means than Holy Mass to obtain this greatest of all graces.

St. Mechtilde is said to have heard from our beloved Lord himself that whoever, during life, has been accustomed to hear Mass devoutly, shall in death be consoled by the presence of the angels and saints and his advocates, who shall safely defend him from all the assaults of the infernal fiends. O what a happy and holy death shall you have if, during life, you shall have endeavored to hear Mass as often as possible!

The second motive is, that you yourself may obtain a speedy release from purgatory, and wing your way to eternal glory, since there is no surer means of receiving from God a grace so precious as that of going direct to heaven, or at least with a short purgatory, than indulgences and the most holy sacrifice of the Mass. The Popes have drawn largely on the treasures of the Church to aid the holy souls by the many indulgences they have granted for them.

And as to the efficacy of the Holy Mass in hastening their deliverance from purgatory, this is already sufficiently proved in what I have already said. But, if you need anything more on this subject, the example and the authority of the great servant of God, John of Avila, the oracle of Spain, ought to suffice. Being asked in his last hours, on his death-bed, what he most earnestly wished to be done for him after death, he answered, "Masses! Masses!"

And now, before dismissing this matter, allow me to give you

a counsel of great moment. Try to get all the Masses which you would wish to have celebrated for you after your death, offered now while you have life and strength. Do not trust to those who may survive you for the fulfilment of this duty. I am the more anxious to impress this on you, as St. Anselm holds that one Mass heard or celebrated for you during life may, perhaps, be more meritorious than a thousand celebrated after your death.

This truth was understood well by a wealthy Genoese merchant who, at his death, left nothing for his own soul. Every one was astonished that a man so rich, so pious, and so generous to all could have been so cruel to himself at the hour of death. But after his burial there was found a record in one of his diaries of what he had done for his soul during life. I here copy some of the entries: " Masses caused to be celebrated for my soul, two thousand lire; for the marriage of poor girls, ten thousand; for such and such a holy sanctuary, two hundred;" and so on.

At the end of this book he wrote: " He who wishes to do good, let him do it during life; not trust to those who may survive him." A very trite old proverb teaches us that " a taper before gives more light than a torch behind." Weigh seriously the excellence of Holy Mass, and you will henceforth be astonished at the blindness in which you lived till now, having disregarded a treasure so great, so immense, and which was, indeed, for you a " Hidden Treasure."

THE EUCHARIST [1]

The Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist is stated with great clearness by the Council of Trent. The Church regards the Eucharist as a sacrament and also as a sacrifice. Considered as a sacrament, the Eucharist is the true body and blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and wine. Like the other sacraments, it was instituted by Christ, and, like them, it consists of an outward part—namely, bread and wine, or the appearance of bread and wine; and an inward or invisible part—namely, the body and blood

[1] See, further, " The Eucharist," in the following chapter.

of Christ, with the grace which they impart to those who communicate worthily.

Christ himself instituted the Eucharist on the night before his Passion. The first three Evangelists, and St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, give the history of the first Eucharist. Our Lord, they tell us, took bread into his hands, and having given thanks (*eucharistesas*, Luke xxii. 19, whence the name *Eucharist*), he broke it and gave it to his disciples, saying, " This is my body which is given for you: this do for a commemoration of me." In the same manner he took the chalice and said, " This is the blood of the New Testament which is shed for you." From this it appears that bread and wine are the matter to be used in the sacrament. The Council of Florence declares that " wheaten bread and wine " are the matter of this sacrament, and nearly all theologians hold that no other kind of bread can be used without invalidating the sacrament, because, when bread without further qualification is mentioned, wheaten bread would be commonly understood.[1] The Council of Florence, in the Decree of Union, defined consecration either in leavened or unleavened bread as valid. Latin priests are bound to use the latter; Orientals, except Maronites and Armenians, use the former. The Latin Church follows the use of Christ, for leavened bread could not have been employed at the Paschal Supper, so that the violent attacks made on the Latin Church for its use of unleavened bread by Michael Cærularius in 1043, and often repeated by the schismatic Greeks, are clearly unwarranted. It is impossible to ascertain with certainty the use of the ancient Church on this head. Sirmond contends that even the Latins used leavened bread for eight hundred years and more. Authorities of equal reputation—namely, Mabillon and Christianus Lupus—hold that the Latins have always used unleavened bread since apostolic times. Bona thinks that, whereas the Greeks have always used leavened bread, the Latins in the early ages used either leavened or unleavened bread according to convenience, and that the use

[1] Ἄρτος is the word used by the Evangelists, and that means wheaten bread, μᾶζα being the word for barley bread.

of the latter was not obligatory among them till the tenth century.[1] The wine must, of course, be the fermented juice of the grape. Water is mixed with it according to a custom which must have been followed by Christ (for the paschal wine, which he used in the first Eucharist, was always so mixed), and which is proved to be apostolic, both because it is mentioned by Justin Martyr[2] in the sub-apostolic age, and because it is followed at this day, not only throughout the Catholic Church in all the varying rites according to which Mass is said, but also by all heretical sects which have preserved the priesthood, with the single exception of the Armenian Monophysites. But the mixture of water with the wine does not belong to the essence of the sacrament, and it must be made in small quantity, since wine, not wine and water, is a constituent part of the matter of the sacrament. Lastly, the bread and the wine are consecrated by the words "This is my body," "This is my blood."

The Council of Trent teaches that, after the consecration, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, are contained "truly, really, and substantially in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist," and it anathematizes those who say that Christ's body and blood are there in sign and figure only, or virtually. Christ is in the Eucharist truly—that is, the words "This is my body" are not, as the Zwinglians contend, a mere figure; he is there really, objectively, so that his presence does not depend, as Calvin said it did, on the faith of the recipient. He is there substantially, which word excludes the Calvinistic error that Christ's body is in heaven and nowhere else, though it exercises its virtue and power in the Eucharist.

The real presence is clearly implied in Scripture. It was taught first of all by our Lord himself in the synagogue at Capharnaum, just a year before his Passion.[3] On the day preceding this discourse, he had fed the five thousand by the miraculous multiplication of bread, and the crowd went to Capharnaum next day in quest of him. Christ rebuked them, because they set greater value on earthly bread than on the food of the soul; and they asked him

[1] Benedict XIV, De Fest., P. I. clxiv. [2] Apol., i, 56. [3] John vi.

for a "sign" in confirmation of his authority. The miracle of the day before was not enough. He had, after all, only fed the crowd with common bread. What was that to the miracle of the desert? "Our fathers eat the manna in the desert, as it is written, he gave them bread from heaven to eat." Christ answered that he was the true bread come down from heaven; the food of the soul to those who believed in him, as the manna had been the food of the body. So far (down to verse 50) there is nothing in the discourse to prove the real presence. But Christ goes on to say, "The bread which I will give" is not my doctrine, but "my flesh." "He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life." The future tense (the bread which I *will* give) shows that the mysterious gift of which Christ spoke was not yet bestowed. It was possible to believe in him, but it was not possible as yet to eat his flesh and drink his blood. This feeding on Christ's flesh and blood can refer only to the Eucharist. No doubt Christ might most fitly have spoken of belief in himself as a feeding on heavenly bread; but to describe faith in him as a feeding on his flesh and blood would be a violent and unnatural use of words in any language, and as addressed to Jews it would have been worse than unnatural. They were accustomed to use the words "eating a man's flesh" metaphorically, but the metaphor signified, not to accept a man's doctrine, but, on the contrary, to treat him with brutal cruelty. Thus the Psalmist speaks of his enemies coming near him to "eat his flesh;" and Job uses similar language of his false friends.[1] Our Lord, therefore, speaks of a literal, not of a metaphorical, eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood. Another argument for the Catholic interpretation is supplied by the way in which Christ's words were received. The Jews exclaimed, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Whereupon our Lord, instead of explaining that he meant only to say that they must believe in his doctrine, repeated his former assertion in the most solemn and emphatic manner: "Amen, amen, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you have not life in you. . . .

[1] Psalm xxvi. 2. Job xix. 22.

My flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink." Others who heard the doctrine from his disciples found it hard and intolerable. To remove the scandal they had taken, Christ appealed to that divine power which he was to manifest in his ascension, and added, "It is the spirit which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life: but there are some of you who do not believe." In the first part of this verse Christ cannot have meant to say that his flesh was absolutely unprofitable: to do so would have been to contradict the substance of his previous discourse, even if we accept the ultra-Protestant interpretation of it. Christ was to give his flesh for the life of the world, so that he could not speak of this flesh as utterly unprofitable. His meaning is that flesh in itself, even his own flesh, apart from that Spirit which God had given him without measure [1] and which was united to it, could not be of any avail. Nor again, in the latter part of the verse, "The words I have spoken to you are spirit and life," does Christ contrast faith in his words with feeding on his flesh, for, apart from other objections, our Lord does not speak of his word generally, but of those particular words which he has just uttered and which some of his hearers did not believe. The discourse in the synagogue had been a scandal to them, and our Lord declares that his words, far from giving any real occasion for scandal, were spirit and life to those who received them; the fault lay not in him or in his words, but in their unbelief.

This exposition is confirmed by the last part of the chapter. Clearly, the Evangelist did not think that Christ had softened down or explained his mysterious promise, for he goes on to tell us that from that time many of Christ's disciples went back and walked no more with him, so that our Lord was constrained to ask the twelve apostles if they also would go away. And Simon Peter answered him: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed, and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God." [2]

[1] John iii. 34.

[2] John vi. 69, 70.

At the Last Supper, Jesus explained, by the institution of the Eucharist, that mysterious eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood which he had announced a year before in the synagogue of Capharnaum. He celebrated with the chosen twelve the paschal rite. This rite was a sacrifice commemorative of Israel's redemption; it was, indeed, the one commemorative sacrifice of the old law. Further, it was a feast upon a sacrifice, and the eating of the paschal lamb bound the Israelites together in the unity of the Jewish church. Christ, as his disciples knew, was the true Paschal Lamb, come to take away the sins of the world. As he substituted his atoning death for the sacrifice of the paschal lamb, so he gave his body and blood in place of the lamb on which they had been used to feast. Just when he was about to abolish types and shadows by his death, he instituted for all time the new paschal rite which was more than a type or shadow. It was to be at one and the same time a sacrifice commemorative of the redemption, a feast on himself, the Lamb of God, the great means of sanctification for his people, and the bond which was to unite the "Israel of God" throughout the world. He said of the bread, "This is my body;" of the wine, "This is my blood;" and he invited his disciples to eat and drink of the banquet prepared for them.

St. Paul testifies to the same doctrine.[1] He warns his disciples against participating in the sacrifices offered to idols, and points out the inconsistency of eating the flesh of victims offered to idols and also eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ. Christians are to "flee from idols" because they receive the Eucharist. St. Paul contrasts the real flesh of victims sacrificed to idols with the real flesh present in the great Christian sacrament. "I cannot partake," he says, "of the table of the Lord and the table of devils"—that is, of idols. And in order that there may be no possibility of mistaking the sense of his words, he asks, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in [*koinonia*] the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?" St. Paul does not say that the con-

[1] 1 Cor. x.

secrated bread and wine are a symbol of Christ's body and blood, but a participation in them. He uses the very same word (*koinonoi*) to describe the "partaking" in the Jewish altar. Persons "partook" in Jewish and heathen sacrifices by really eating the flesh of the victim; just in the same way they "partook" of the Christian Eucharist. But the participation in each case was ordered to ends widely different from each other, so that it was a gross inconsistency to unite any two of the three different participations with each other.

We select a few from the mass of patristic testimonies to the doctrine of the real presence. St. Ignatius, St. John's disciple, arguing against the Docetæ, who denied the reality of our Lord's body altogether, points out the consequences of this unbelief. Not admitting that our Lord took on himself true flesh, those men "abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ."[1] Had the Church of those days believed that the Eucharist was no more than a symbol, there was nothing in the celebration of the sacrament which need have offended them. They granted that our Lord had an apparent body, and they could offer no objection to the commemoration of his death under a symbolic form. But they could not partake in a sacrament which professed to communicate the true body of Christ, for the simple reason that they denied the reality of Christ's body altogether. It may be worth while to mention, in passing, that the celebrated Protestant commentator Meyer admits the force of this passage.[2] In an historical account of the Eucharistic doctrine, appended to his commentary on St. Matthew, he allows that St. Ignatius, in opposition to the Docetæ, "undoubtedly states the doctrine that in the Eucharist Christ's flesh and blood are given in a real way." In the earliest account which we possess of the Eucharistic celebration among the primitive Christians we find the same unhesitating belief in the real presence. "This food," says Justin Martyr, who died in the year 166, "is known among us as the Eucharist. . . . We do not receive

[1] Ignat. Ad Smyrn., 7.

[2] Meyer (trans.), Comm. on St. Matthew, 5th ed., 1864.

these things as common bread and common drink; but as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have been taught that the food over which thanks have been given [*eucharistetheisan*], through prayer in his words, and from which our blood and flesh are nourished in such a way as to be changed, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."[1] St. Justin considers the presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the Eucharist as certain as the fact that he took flesh and blood in his incarnation. And here again we may remark that Meyer interprets Justin just as we do. At the close of the second century, St. Irenæus, the disciple of St. Polycarp, who was the disciple of St. John, himself the disciple of Jesus (thus completing a chain of testimony absolutely without historic parallel), uses the very argument against the Gnostics which St. Ignatius had employed against the Docetæ. Against the Gnostic error that the material world is evil and that Christ was not the Son of that inferior God who made the world, St. Irenæus argues thus: "If the Lord came from another father, how did he act justly when, taking the bread of the creation which lies around us, he confessed that it was his own body, and affirmed that the mixture of the chalice [wine mixed with water] was his own blood?"[2] Again, repelling the Gnostic error that the flesh is incapable of salvation, and so would not rise again, St. Irenæus argues that, on the Gnostic theory, Christ would not have redeemed us with his blood, or sanctified our bodies with his own body and blood in the Eucharist. "If this flesh of ours is not saved, then clearly the Lord did not redeem us with his blood, nor is the chalice of the Eucharist the communication of his blood, nor the bread which we break the communication of his body. For there is no blood except that which comes from veins and flesh and the rest of man's substance, which human substance the Word of God truly became. He redeemed us with his blood; . . . and since we are his members and are nourished through his creatures, and since he himself bestows his creatures on us, . . . he confessed that the

[1] Justin, Apol., i. 66.

[2] Iren., iv. 33. 2.

chalice [taken] from the creature was his proper blood, with which he bedews our blood, and the bread [taken] from the creature he affirmed with a strong affirmation to be his proper body, from which he nourishes our bodies." [1] Let the reader observe that St. Irenæus puts the blood of Christ in the Eucharist in the same category with that shed on the cross, the former being real, just as the latter was real; next, that Irenæus tells us what he means by blood—namely, literal blood, taken from the veins; lastly, that Irenæus intimates that he is speaking of a stupendous mystery, for he tells us that our Saviour solemnly or strongly affirmed (*diebebaiosato*) that the bread was his proper body. We may conclude our patristic citations on this head with a few words from Cyril of Jerusalem (died 386). "Since, then, he has declared and said of the bread, 'This is my body,' who after that will venture to doubt? And seeing that he has affirmed and said, 'This is my blood,' who will raise a question and say it is not his blood?" [2] Even if the witness of Scripture to the real presence were doubtful, the fact that a doctrine so mysterious, so difficult to reason, found such speedy and universal acceptance throughout the Church that Ignatius, a disciple of St. John, could take it for granted in his controversy with heretics, should be enough to turn the scale in favor of the Catholic interpretation.

It is not enough to confess Christ's real presence in the Eucharist. The Council of Trent requires us further to confess the "change of the whole substance of the bread into the body, of the whole substance of the wine into the blood [of Christ], only the appearances of bread and wine remaining; which change the Catholic Church most fitly calls *transubstantiation.*" The word "transubstantiation" appears to have come into use during the controversy with Berengarius, and a person who rejected it as "foolish and barbarous" would not thereby fall into heresy, though his conduct, Suarez says, would be scandalous and rash, and would expose him to just suspicion of heresy. But the word implies a truth beyond the mere fact of Christ's presence in the sacrament;

[1] Iren., v. 2, 2.

[2] Cyril. Hierosol., xxii. 4.

and this truth is of faith. It is necessary, then, to begin by explaining the word.

The Church has adopted the distinction made by the Aristotelians between substance and accident. The essence or substance is that which constitutes the thing, which makes it what it is, and it is distinct from accidents or qualities which may change, while the thing itself remains. Common sense teaches us this distinction. If water undergoes certain accidental changes—for example, if, having been cold, it becomes heated to the boiling-point—we still call it water: in other words, we recognize the fact that, though the water has become hot instead of cold, the substance of water is there still, and that the change is merely accidental. If, however, the water were changed by natural process into blood, or grape-juice, or again by miracle into wine, any one would see that not merely the qualities, but the thing was changed. The substance of water would have ceased to be, and would have been replaced by that of grape-juice, blood, or wine. Substance is the inner reality in which the qualities or accidents inhere, or, in the more exact language of the Schools, substance is that which naturally stands by itself without any subject or substratum in which it inheres. An accident is that which naturally inheres in a substance as its subject or substratum. Now, whereas the change which the elements in the other sacraments undergo is an accidental (whereas, for example, the water in baptism remains water, and simply receives a new power to cleanse from sin), the change of the elements in the Eucharist is an essential or substantial one. The substance of bread and wine ceases to be, for it is changed into Christ's body and blood. In one respect, however, this substantial change differs from all other substantial changes. In other cases, when one substance changes into another, the accidents also change. Here the accidents of bread and wine remain unaltered; and so long as they remain, the body and blood of Christ also remain concealed beneath them. Hence it follows that in the Eucharist there is no deception of the senses. What we see, feel, or taste in the Blessed Sacrament is real, for the accidents are real

entities, and the accidents are all that the senses ever do perceive. From the existence of the accidents reason infers that of the substance to which they naturally correspond, but with regard to the Eucharist this inference would be false, since faith assures us that in this case the accidents conceal the body and blood of Christ, not the substances of bread and wine. It is, moreover, because the accidents remain that the Eucharist is a sacrament. They constitute the outward part—they are the sensible sign of that refreshment of the soul which follows from a worthy reception of the Blessed Sacrament.

Taking for granted the real presence, we may fairly claim to prove the doctrine of transubstantiation from the words of consecration as given in the Gospels. On the Lutheran theory of consubstantiation—according to which the substances of bread and wine are still present after consecration, though the substance of Christ's body is there also—Christ could not have said, "This is my body," but only "My body is here"—"My body is present with this bread." The sensible signs or accidents indicate the substance which underlies them; so long, therefore, as the substance of bread remains, the proposition "This is bread" must be true, and any other proposition—for example, "This is Christ's body" —must be false. It is of no avail to urge that Christ's body is also present. The question is not whether it is present, but whether it is directly indicated by the accidents of bread. If the substance of bread remains, the natural connection between accidents and substance remains also; and to say of bread, "This is Christ's body," is not less absurd than it would be to say of bread in which a gold coin was concealed, "This" (pointing to the bread) "is gold." True, we may point to a cask and say, "This is wine," because everybody knows that the cask is meant to contain liquid, and by a permissible license of speech we put the thing which contains for that which is contained in it. But the accidents of bread are not intended, on the theory of consubstantiation, either by nature or use, to contain the body of Christ; and the word "this" could only signify the substance of bread visible by its accidents.

We pass to patristic testimonies, and here we shall have an opportunity of adding to the proofs from tradition already given for the real presence; and we shall also be able to set the doctrine of transubstantiation in a clearer light, and to show that, although the term is philosophical, the truth which it implies is very simple. The Fathers, then, imply this belief in transubstantiation when they say that the bread is changed into or becomes the body of Christ; because, on any theory except that of transubstantiation, the substance of bread remains, and is not, therefore, changed into another substance. The following quotations are taken from Cardinal Franzelin's treatise on the Eucharist. Tertullian says: "Taking bread, he made it his body."[1] Cyril of Jerusalem: "Of old he changed water into wine, which is akin to blood, in Cana of Galilee; shall we think him unworthy of faith now that he has changed wine into blood?"[2] The change of water into wine was, of course, an instance of transubstantiation; so, also, according to Cyril, is the change effected in the Eucharist. "Before consecration," says St. Ambrose, "it is called something else; after consecration it is named blood; and thou sayest 'amen'—*i. e.*, it is true."[3] St. James of Sarug writes: "From the point of time when he took bread and called it his body, it was not bread, but his body." Theodoret, on Matthew xxvi. 26: "It [the bread] is changed by a wonderful operation, though to us it appears bread. . . . Bread, indeed, it appears to us, but flesh in fact [*to onti*] it is." Against such testimonies (which might easily be multiplied) it is useless to quote passages from Scripture or the Fathers in which the appearances which remain after consecration are called bread and wine. They are naturally called according to the outward appearance which they present; and it would be easy to prove, by the same argument, that Catholics at the present day do not believe in transubstantiation.

The Council of Trent defines that Christ is contained whole and entire under either species—namely, that his body, blood, soul, and divinity are given both under the form of bread and under that

[1] Tertull. Adv. Marc., iv. 40. [2] Cyril. Hierosol., iv. 1, 2. [3] Ambrose, De Myster., ix. 54.

of wine. Where Christ's body is, there his Godhead must be also, because by the hypostatic union the Godhead became indissolubly united to human nature. Moreover, as Christ, having died once, lives forevermore, it follows that the human soul must needs be united to that risen and glorified Body which we receive in communion. Hence Christ speaks of eating his flesh as equivalent to eating him.[1] Further, the same kind of reasoning certifies that Christ is given whole and entire under either kind. True, the force of the words of consecration puts the body under the appearance of bread, the blood under the appearance of wine; but Christ has no body except that glorified one united to his blood—no blood except such as is united to his body. Otherwise Christ would be slain over again every time Mass is said; for on each occasion the body would be separated from the blood. Again, the constant practice of the Church relieves us from any fear that this reasoning may be precarious. Since the Council of Constance it has been the general law in the West that all except the celebrant should communicate only under the species of bread. And the Church, though it has changed its discipline in this matter, has by no means introduced a new principle. Infants among the early Christians received communion under the form of wine, and sick persons, solitaries, and others, under the one form of bread. The principle was fixed—namely, that Christ was given whole and entire under either species; it was merely the application of this principle which varied.

The Council of Trent goes on to say that whole Christ is present under every separate part of each species (*sub singulis cujusque speciei partibus, separatione facta*). What has been said in defence of Christ's presence under either species admits of obvious application here; and we will only add that Christ said of the divided host, "This is my body."

This seems the fitting place to explain what theologians mean by the spiritual presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist. It is not meant to deny that Christ's body in the Eucharist is a real one (such a denial would be heresy); but just as all bodies after the

[1] "He that eateth me; . . . he that eateth this bread." John vi. 57, 58.

resurrection become spiritual without ceasing to be bodies, because they have certain properties of spirit—so it is with Christ's body in the Eucharist, only to a much wider extent and in a more wonderful way. At one and the same time, Christ's body is in heaven and on a thousand altars. As the spirit is present entire in the whole body and in each part of it, so the body of Christ, with all its substance and qualities, is present in each host and in each part of the host. Consequently, the Eucharistic body of Christ is not extended in space—that is, one part of Christ's body does not correspond to one particular part of the host. All this, of course, involves a series of stupendous miracles. It does not, however, imply any contradiction; and nothing, we know, is impossible to God Almighty.

The ministration of the Eucharist is committed to priests. They alone can consecrate validly; for it was his apostles, and not the faithful generally, to whom Christ said, "Do this for a commemoration of me." Justin, in his account of the Eucharist already referred to, speaks of the *proestos*, or president, as the celebrant; and Tertullian tells us that the Eucharist "was taken from the hands of nobody else except those of the presidents."[1] The "president" is evidently another word for the bishop, who, in early times, celebrated the Eucharist while the priests around him joined in the sacred acts as *consacrificantes*. The First General Council takes for granted that priests alone can consecrate. It condemns the abuse of deacons administering the Eucharist to priests, because it was unseemly that those who could not sacrifice should "give the body of Christ" to those who could offer it.

The Eucharist, of course, remains the body of Christ, whoever administers it. But priests alone do so lawfully and by virtue of their office.[2] Deacons may administer it if empowered to do so, and at one time they did commonly give the chalice to communicants.

To communicate with profit, we must do so without the stain of mortal sin on the soul. This appears from St. Paul's words, "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread and

[1] Tertull., De Corona Mil., 3.

[2] Concil. Trid., xiii. 8.

drink of the chalice";[1] from the constant practice of Christian antiquity, as testified by the declaration of the Fathers, the exclusion of penitents from communion, and the words "sancta sanctis" in the ancient liturgies; from the nature of the sacrament, which is intended as the food of the soul, and therefore can confer no benefit on a soul dead by sin.[2] In a soul duly disposed, the Eucharist produces effects similar to those of natural food on the body. It unites us to Christ, the author of grace and virtue. It sustains and increases the spiritual life; it repairs the injuries done to the soul by sin, for it increases the love of God and of true virtue, and fills us with spiritual sweetness; on the same grounds, it preserves the Christian from future falls. It is also both to soul and body the pledge of future glory, since Christ is bestowed on us for this special end, that we may preserve and obtain that happiness which God reserves for the virtuous; while the body has a new title to a glorious resurrection. It is fitting that Christ should regard the flesh of the worthy communicant with a special interest, and conform it in due time to his own glorified body.

THE EUCHARIST AS A SACRIFICE

A SACRIFICE is defined as "the oblation of a sensible thing made to God through a lawful minister, by a real change in the thing offered, to testify God's absolute authority over us and our entire dependence on him." Catholic theologians have generally taught that in sacrifice the life of the victim—or the existence of the thing, if the oblation be of a thing without life—is substituted for the life of those in whose name it is offered. The thing offered must be visible, for sacrifice pertains to external worship, and it is only in a metaphorical sense that the prayer of the heart and the like are called sacrifices. It can be made lawfully to God alone, for no

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 27.

[2] One exception must be here made. Many theologians hold that a person who, without fault of his own, approaches communion in a state of mortal sin, for which he has supernatural sorrow, but not that sorrow known as perfect contrition, would be reconciled to God in the act of reception. Such a case might occur, for example, if a person erroneously supposed that he had been absolved.

other but he is the Lord of life and death, and the very act of sacrifice must effect a change which destroys, or tends to destroy, that which is offered, for without this destruction we should fail to confess by an external act God's supreme dominion, and so to satisfy the end of all sacrifice. Such sacrifices were offered from the earliest times to the true God by the patriarchs, and, among heathen nations, to their false deities. God accepted and approved sacrificial worship from the first; and when the law was given to the people of Israel, sacrifice was enjoined and its mode carefully regulated on divine authority. Christ offered on the cross a sacrifice for our redemption, and from that moment the Jewish sacrifices ceased to have any efficacy. They were instituted to typify the sacrifice of Christ, and now that the reality had come, the types were no longer needed. The worship of sacrifice, however, was not to cease in the Church, and the Council of Trent defines that in the Eucharist or Mass a true and proper sacrifice is offered to God.

The Old Testament foretells this sacrifice of the Mass just as clearly as it predicts the sacrifice of the cross. No prophet seems to speak more lightly of the Jewish ritual than Jeremias. He looks forward to a time when the ark of the covenant will not be remade or even missed. "They will not say any more, 'The ark of the covenant of the Lord,' and it will not be thought of; they will not remember it or miss it, and it will not be made again."[1] He looks forward, instead, to that new covenant which God will write on the heart. But is there to be no sacrifice under this new covenant? Let the following passage answer: "In those days Judah will be saved, and Jerusalem will dwell confidently, and this is the name which they will call it [Jerusalem], the Lord our justice. For thus saith the Lord, a man shall not be cut off to David sitting on the throne of the house of Israel; and to the priests, the Levites, a man shall not be cut off from before my face presenting the holocaust and offering the meat [or flour] offering and making sacrifice all the days. And the word of the Lord came to Jeremias, saying: Thus saith the Lord, if ye will break my covenant [consisting in] the

[1] Jer. iii. 16.

day and my covenant [consisting in] the night, so that there should be no more daytime and night in their season; then also shall my covenant be broken with David my servant, so that he should not have a son reigning on his throne, and with the Levites, the priests who minister to me. As the host of the heavens cannot be numbered, and the sand of the sea cannot be measured, so I will multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites who minister to me." [1] Evidently this is a Messianic prophecy. The son of David is, as orthodox Protestants gladly admit, no other than Christ the son of David, and the son of God. Surely, then, there is no escape from the conclusion that in the Messianic kingdom—that is, in the Church—sacrifice will continue to be offered, and will last while sun and moon endure, or, in other words, till the end of the world and of the Christian dispensation. A recent Protestant writer who belongs to the sceptical school, and has scant sympathy with Catholic doctrine, admits that "taken literally, the eternity of Levitical sacrifices, as expressed in xxxiii. 18, seems quite inconsistent with all else in Jeremias' prophecies," and, "taken typically, fits only the sacrifice of the Mass to which Roman Catholic expositors refer it; for the sacrifices are to be offered continually in all time." [2]

Malachias (Malachi), in a familiar passage, expresses the same idea still more strongly and definitely. He speaks of God as rejecting the Jewish sacrifices. "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, and a meat [or flour] offering I will not accept from your hands." But is sacrifice to cease? On the contrary, "from the rising of the sun even to its going down, great is my name among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure flour offering, since great is my name among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts." [3] The sacrifices of the old law were offered only in Palestine; the new sacrifice of Messianic times is to be offered among the Gentiles. Jewish sacrifices could be offered only in one place; the new sacrifice is to be offered all over the world.

[1] Jer. xxxiii. 16 *et seq.*
[2] Robertson Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 402.
[3] Mal. i. 10, 11.

The sacrifice here predicted cannot be that of the cross, which was made once for all on Calvary. The rabbins and Protestant scholars, whether sceptical or orthodox, have been utterly unable to explain this passage even plausibly. To say with Ebn Ezra and Kimchi [1] that the prophet means that the heathen would, if God commanded them to do so, offer acceptable sacrifice, is doing violence to the plain meaning of the words. Again, the whole context, which speaks of sacrifice in the literal sense, excludes the supposition that the offering of the Gentiles is to be a mere sacrifice of praise and prayer; nor would a prophet of the Persian period have regarded the offering of such a sacrifice in every place as anything extraordinary.[2] Still more desperate is Hitzig's interpretation, which attributes to Malachias the modern and utterly un-Hebrew notion that "Jahve, Ormuzd, Zeus, and perhaps others, were only different names of the one Supreme God." The sacrifice of the Mass, and that only, satisfies the requirements of a scientific exegesis.

Christ, at the Last Supper, fulfilled these prophecies and instituted the transfigured Passover of the new law, in which he himself, the true Paschal Lamb, was to be continually sacrificed and eaten. When he blessed the bread and wine, his eye was fixed on the morrow when he was to suffer and die; but his priesthood, begun when he assumed our human nature, was not to end with a single act of sacrifice. He was to continue it throughout time by the hands of his earthly representatives, who were to offer him on the altars of the Church under the forms of bread and wine. He speaks of himself under the forms of bread and wine as already in the state of a victim offered as sacrifice for men. He speaks of his body in the Eucharist as "given for you," [3] just as he had said a year before:

[1] Quoted by Steiner in his commentary published in 1881.

[2] This interpretation, adopted by many Protestants (for example, by Keil), is given in the Targum. In the Chaldee the verse is paraphrased thus: "Since from the rising of the sun and to its setting great is my name among the peoples, and in every time when you do my will, I will receive your prayer, and my great name will be sanctified by means of you, and your prayer shall be as a pure oblation before me, since great is my name among the peoples, saith Jehovah of hosts."

[3] Luke xxii. 19.

" The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." [1] He says of the chalice—that is, of the blood therein contained—that it is " shed for you." [2] We lay no stress on the fact that it is the present and not the future tense which Christ employs; to do so would show great ignorance of Scriptural usage. But the fact remains that Christ speaks of the body under the form of bread, of the blood in the chalice as presented in a sacrificial state for the life of men. The perpetual sacrifice of the altar was to be one with the sacrifice of the cross. The one offering worthy of God was to replace the typical sacrifices prescribed in the Pentateuch. The sacrifice of the altar was to represent and commemorate that of the cross, and also to supply all that was wanting in the latter. The Jews were commanded to eat of their peace-offerings, and so to enter into communion with God. No one could eat of the sacrifice offered on Calvary, but Christians for all time were to feed on the Divine Victim present in the Eucharistic oblation. The sacrifice of the cross was offered once; in the sacrifice of the altar the Christian Church was provided with the noblest form of worship, to be offered day by day. The sacrifice of the cross was " dishonored, without public testimony to its dignity and power." The sacrifice of the altar was to be the centre of the Church's worship and solemnities, the object of her unceasing veneration. It was to unite the faithful to God and to each other; it was to teach them how to offer themselves, body and soul, in sacrifice to God in union with the perfect sacrifice of Christ; it was to separate them wholly and utterly from participation in Jewish and heathen sacrifices. This last point is clearly brought out by St. Paul in a way which shows beyond possibility of mistake his belief in the Eucharistic sacrifice. In urging the Corinthians not to partake in heathen sacrifices, he reminds them that the Eucharistic bread imparts the body of Christ; the chalice of benediction, his blood; and he concludes, " Ye cannot partake in the table of the Lord and the table of devils." The table of devils was, of course, the heathen altar, and partaking in the table of devils means eating of the sacrifices offered

[1] John vi. 52. [2] Luke xxii. 20.

to false gods, whom St. Paul declares to be really demons. The apostle therefore sets altar against altar, sacrifice against sacrifice, communion against communion.

This belief in the sacrifice of the altar has prevailed at all times and all places within the Church. St. Ignatius tells the Philadelphians that they must partake of one Eucharist, since there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ; one chalice which unites us to his blood; one *thusiasterion*, or place of sacrifice. "The chalice," says Irenæus, "which comes from this world of ours, he [Christ] confessed to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which oblation the Church, receiving it from the apostles, offers in the whole world to God." [1] "The oblation of the Church," he continues, referring to the prophecy of Malachi, "which our Lord taught to be offered in the whole world, is counted a pure sacrifice before God." He proves that Catholics alone have the right to celebrate this new oblation, heretics being excluded because a belief in the real presence is inconsistent with their other theories; Jews, because "their hands are full of blood, for they have not received the Word which is offered to God." [2] This is nothing less than a distinct assertion of the Catholic truth that the Divine Victim who shed his blood for us on the cross applies to us the merits of his Passion, by offering himself continually on the altar. We may add that the Fathers, from very early times, explained the words in Psalm cx, "Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedech," as referring to the Eucharistic sacrifice. They knew, from the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Melchisedech, "the king of justice and of peace," was a type of Christ. They remembered the words in Genesis xiv. 18, "Melchisedech, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, and he was the priest of God most high," and the prophecy in Psalm cx, "Thou are a priest for ever, according to the order or manner of Melchisedech," and accordingly they found the reality typified by Melchisedech in the Eucharist when Christ offers himself through his priests under the appearances of bread and wine. "Who," asks Cyprian, "is more truly a priest of

[1] Iren., iv. 17, 5, 18, 1. [2] *Ibid.* iv. 18, 4.

God most high than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the same sacrifice which Melchisedech offered (that is, bread and wine)—namely, his own body and blood?"[1] "His body," says St. Augustine, "is offered up instead of all those sacrifices and oblations, and it is given to the communicants." Ambrose, Chrysostom, and a multitude of other Fathers hold similar language. The ancient liturgies, written in many languages and used in many different parts of the Church, testify likewise to the universality of this belief. They speak of the "tremendous, divine, unbloody, the perpetual, the living sacrifice" of the Lamb, "who, being sacrificed, never dies"; they declare that "our sacrifice is the body and blood of the Priest himself, Christ our Lord."

Having established the truth of the Church's doctrine on the sacrifice of the Mass, it only remains to state and explain that doctrine more fully, avoiding, however, as far as possible, merely scholastic questions. All that is included in the idea of sacrifice is found in the Eucharist. There is the oblation of a sensible thing—namely, of the body and blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine. The oblation is made by a lawful minister—that is, by Christ himself acting through earthly priests, who are his representatives. There is a mystical destruction of the Victim, for Christ presents himself on the altar "as in a state of death, because he is deprived of those functions of natural life which he exercised on earth, and because he is there with the signs of death through the mystical separation between body and blood"[2] made by the words of consecration. There is the protestation of God's supreme dominion, for the Mass is and can be offered to God alone. Moreover, it fulfils the form and ends of sacrifice. Like the holocausts, it offers homage to God; like the sin-offerings, it propitiates him by the very fact that it is an oblation of Christ, the Victim for our sins. Like the peace-offerings, it pleads for grace, for we offer here the Vic-

[1] "Suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem." Cyprian, ep. 63.

[2] Le Brun, Explication de la Messe, i. 22. The words of consecration would of themselves put the body only under the form of bread, the blood only under that of wine, were it not for the fact of concomitance explained above.

tim of our peace. In this sacrifice of thanksgiving we offer God the most excellent gift he has bestowed on us—namely, the Son in whom he is well pleased.

Lastly, the sacrifice of the altar is one with that of the cross. True, no blood is shed on the altar, nor does Christ die any more, so that it is by the sacrifice of the cross, not of the Mass, that we were redeemed from sin and its penalties. But on the cross and altar we have the same Victim and the same priest, and therefore, in the words of the Council of Trent, the sacrifice of the Mass, though a commemoration, is "not a mere commemoration of the sacrifice on the cross." It is truly "propitiatory," and may be offered for the living and dead, for sins and penalties, for satisfaction and other needs, spiritual and temporal. "Moved," says the same Council, "by offering up this sacrifice, the Lord, granting grace and the gift of repentance, forgives crimes and sins, even if they be great"; and, in another place, that "it is the most efficacious means of helping the souls in purgatory." The Mass is offered for the salvation of all the living and of all the dead who still suffer in the state of purgation; but it may also be applied specially for the needs of individuals. It is necessary that the priest should communicate in every Mass which he celebrates, for consumption of the species forms an integral part of the sacrifice, but it is not necessary that any one else should do so. The Council of Trent does, indeed, express a desire that in each Mass the faithful who assist, as well as the priest, should communicate; but it "does not condemn, as private and unlawful, those Masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally, but approves and even commends them, since such Masses should be considered public (*communes*), partly because the people in them communicate spiritually, partly because they are celebrated by a public minister of the Church, not for himself only, but for all the faithful who belong to the body of Christ."

In the Eucharist Christ gives himself to be the food of the soul; and every host is consecrated in order that ultimately it may be received by the communicant. Thus the host which

is used for Benediction is, after a few days, received by the priest at Mass, and the particles reserved in the tabernacle are all given to communicants and replaced by other particles. However, as food has the qualities which nourish before it is eaten, the actual reception being only the condition without which it will not actually nourish, so the Eucharist, so long as the appearances of bread and wine remain, is always the true body and blood of Christ. This truth appears from the words of institution. Our Lord said of the bread, "This is my body"; not "This will be my body the moment you receive it"; and it is defined by the Council of Trent.[1] In consequence of this belief, the Church has from the earliest times treated the Blessed Sacrament with the most anxious reverence. "We are full of anxiety," says Tertullian, "lest anything of our chalice and bread should fall to the ground."[2] Severe penalties were imposed, both in the East and in the West, upon the ministers of the altar, if through their negligence any accident happened to the Blessed Sacrament. Again, the Church commands, and at the same time regulates by stringent laws, the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the sick. Lastly, Catholics pay to the Eucharist, present on the altar, reserved in the tabernacle, or carried in procession—to the Eucharist, in short, wherever it may be present—that supreme worship which is due to God alone. "The Eucharist," says the Council of Trent, "is not the less to be adored because Christ instituted it in order that it might be received; for we believe that that same God is present in it of whom the eternal Father, bringing him into the world, said, 'Let all the angels of God adore him'; that God whom the Magi adored, falling down before him; who, finally, was adored by the apostles in Galilee, as the Scripture bears witness."

DIVINE EFFICACY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

The Holy Eucharist is the most precious treasure of the Catholic Church. When our Divine Lord, sitting by Jacob's well, asked

[1] Concil. Trid., Sess. xiii, can. 4.

[2] Tertull., De Corona Mil., 3.

the Samaritan woman to give him to drink from the waters of the well, he took occasion to speak to her of another water of life which he would give. "Ah!" said he—yearning not for her salvation alone, but for that of millions besides—"ah! if thou didst know the gift of God and who he is that saith to thee, give me to drink, thou perhaps wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee, living water. Whoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again: but he that shall drink of the water that I will give shall not thirst for ever."[1] What is this living and life-giving water of which our Divine Lord speaks? It is the Holy Eucharist, the well-spring of life, at which the soul athirst for God's grace can satisfy its desires to the full. They who drink from it drink from the fountainhead of all grace, and, replenished by those life-giving draughts, they grow day by day in holiness of life, till in the end they pass hence to a life of everlasting glory with Christ.

At another time Jesus, having fed five thousand people with five loaves and two fishes, was followed next day by an immense crowd, expecting that he would feed them again with the bread which perisheth; whereupon he took occasion to discourse to them of the bread of life which perisheth not. "Labor not," said he, "for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto life everlasting, which the Son of Man will give you. . . . This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that if any man eat of it he may not die."[2] What is this bread "which cometh down from heaven, that if any man eat of it he may not die"? Our Lord tells us in the words immediately following: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever, and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world. . . . Amen, amen, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up on the last day."[3] Well did our Lord redeem his word of promise! The bread of life here spoken of he gave on the eve of his death, when he insti-

[1] John iv. 13, 14. [2] John vi. 27, 50. [3] *Ibid.* 51, 52, 54, 55.

JESUS AND THE SAMARITAN WOMAN

FROM THE PAINTING BY GUIDO RENI

"The woman saith to him: 'I know that the Messias cometh (who is called Christ): therefore, when he is come, he will tell us all things.' Jesus saith to her: 'I am he, who am speaking with thee.'"

tuted the Holy Eucharist, leaving his own most precious body and blood as a legacy of his love to his followers for all time to come. "And, whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye and eat; This is my body. And, taking the chalice, he gave thanks: and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." [1]

Thus has our Lord of his all-bounteous goodness provided for our souls a heavenly food, wherewith they may be nourished unto life everlasting. For our mortal bodies he provided ample and suitable nourishment, making all nature tributary to man, to whom he gave power over every living thing—the fishes of the sea, and the birds of the air, and the beasts of the field; so that not a blade of grass springs from the earth but what he quickens into life for the support of his creature man. Having thus provided for the perishable body, he provides for the godlike, spiritual, immortal soul a divine, spiritual, and immortal food—even his own most precious body and blood, present in the adorable Eucharist. And as the body cannot grow or live without being supplied with food meet for its sustenance, so neither can the soul grow in holiness or maintain its spiritual life, but must languish and die, unless we partake of the bread of life in the Holy Eucharist. "Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."

By worthily partaking of the blessed Eucharist, we are body and soul closely united with our Lord in this present world, which union, so it be not finally interrupted and broken off by sin, is the forerunner and the pledge of a still closer union with him in the world to come—of future immortality, in which the body as well as the soul will participate. Since the material food taken into our bodies and incorporated with the substance becomes one with them, the body and blood of the Lord, when we partake of them, are sacramentally incorporated with the substance of our bodies, so that

[1] Matt. xxvi. 26–28.

Christ becomes the bone of our bone and the flesh of our flesh, and we may with truth be called, in the language of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Chrisiophoroi*, "carriers of Christ," and "concorporeal," having the same body with him. Wondrous union this of the body and blood of Christ with our mortal bodies, plainly indicated by our Lord when he said, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." Very remarkable are the words of St. Cyril of Jerusalem on this same subject: "Therefore with fullest assurance let us partake of [them] as the body and blood of Christ: for in the form of bread is given to thee his body, and in the form of wine his blood; that thou, by partaking of the body and blood of Christ, mayst be made of the same body and the same blood with him. For thus, too, we become carriers of Christ, because his body and blood are diffused through our members: thus it is that, according to the blessed Peter, we become partakers of the divine nature." [1]

More wonderful than that of the body is the union of the soul with Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist, whereby the Christian advances day by day, as by so many steps of a ladder, from grace to grace, and from virtue to virtue, and "from glory to glory," "unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ," [2] imitating, though it be at a great distance, the example of him of whom it is written that "he advanced in wisdom, and age, and grace with God and man." [3]

The union of soul and body with our Lord in the blessed Eucharist, if preserved to the end of life, is the prelude to, and the cause of, our union with him forever in the glory of his heavenly kingdom, when we shall see him, not as now, "through a glass in a dark manner, but face to face" [4]—not hidden under the sacramental forms, but revealed to us in the fullness of his unclouded glory. Nor is it the soul only that will see the glory of the Lord, but also the body. Perish in the grave the poor body will, but not forever. It had the seeds of immortality planted in it, because during life it was nourished with the body and blood of Christ, and it is not fit that the body which had been nourished with the body and

[1] Cyril. Hierosol., iv. [2] Eph. iv. 13. [3] Luke ii. 52. [4] Eph. xiii. 12.

blood of Christ should perish forever in the grave. It will not so perish: it will rise to immortal life. The dry bones will be gathered together, and they will be covered once more with flesh, and once again the breath of life will be breathed into the body, which, endued with new life, will be reunited to its companion soul, that both together may enter into the glory of the Lord, which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," and which it hath not "entered into the heart of man to conceive."[1] Behold the faith and the hope of the Christian which we make profession of in the Apostles' Creed! "I believe in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting." Behold the faith and the hope which rest upon the Holy Eucharist! The Holy Eucharist it was which, from age to age, and in all ages, imparted life to the Church, giving zeal to the apostles to extend the kingdom of Christ to the ends of the earth, giving courage to the martyrs to die for his name, giving endurance to the confessors to maintain his cause in the face of the world, giving chastity to the virgins to lead the lives of angels upon earth, giving sanctity to Christians in every rank and state to live up to the holy law of God.

Does temporal affliction weigh heavily upon your spirit? Come to Jesus in the sacrament, and he will make everything light and easy to bear. Do you mourn for the loss of some dear departed one? Seek your Lord in the Holy Communion, and in him you will find a true Comforter for your sorrow-stricken soul. Are you compassed round about with the temptations of the enemy? Here is the helmet of salvation and the shield of faith wherewith to resist "the fiery darts of the most wicked one."[2] Does pain rack your limbs or your body? In this balm of life you will find an assuager of your pain far more soothing than all the balm of Gilead. Are the shadows of death deepening around you? Is the grave about to close over your mortal remains? Receive your Lord into your bosom, and then you may exclaim with St. Paul: "O death! where is thy victory? O death! where is thy sting?"[3] All through life's journey the Holy Eucharist is our food, our strength, our life.

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 9. [2] Eph. vi. 16. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 55.

When the battle of the Christian life begins, when the passions of youth are more or less developed, at that critical period the young person gets strength and courage, in the first Communion, to fight against the world, the flesh, and the devil. In the long warfare continued through the period of manhood on to old age, the Christian soldier, if he will not succumb to his enemies, if he will successfully fight the battles of the Lord, takes care to recruit his strength by frequent Communion. And, in the great final struggle, when he has to look death in the face, he is strengthened by the Holy Viaticum; and, being so strengthened, he defeats the enemy's last and most desperate efforts, and passes safely through death to life eternal. It is, after a manner, with us Christians as once it was with the prophet Elias. As, in the strength of the food brought to him by the angel of God, the Prophet "walked forty days and forty nights unto the mount of God, Horeb,"[1] so the Christian, fortified by the bread of angels, pursues his way through the wilderness of this life without fainting, and passes safely through the many perils which beset his path, till at the end of his journey he happily reaches the true mount of God, higher and holier than Horeb—heaven itself.

And all are bidden to the Eucharistic banquet by the Divine Master of the feast. From the sacred tabernacle our Lord lovingly stretches forth his arms, saying to us every one: "Eat, O friends, and drink, and be inebriated."[2] "Come to me, all you that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you."[3] Is it possible that any one should be found not to hearken to this loving invitation? Alas! it is but too true. Some there are who never come to the table of the Lord; others come, but come too seldom; others, again, come who had better stay away, because when they do come it is to profane the holiest of things. Would to God it could be said that, in these our days, there were none to profane the body and blood of our Lord by receiving them unworthily! But, seeing that in the time of the apostles themselves there were those who, according to the testimony of St. Paul, ate and drank "damnation to themselves,

[1] 3 Kings xix. 8. [2] Cant. v. 1. [3] Matt. xi. 28.

not discerning the body of the Lord,"[1] who would be bold enough to assert that in a degenerate age such as ours, when faith is so much on the wane and charity has waxed so cold, there are not unworthy communions, as there were then, and in such number, too, as to draw down the judgments of God? Who can say but that in many and many instances, temporal calamities, epidemics, premature deaths, are the chastisements God inflicts nowadays for the profanation of the holy mystery, just as in the days of St. Paul he inflicted similar chastisements upon those guilty of the same dreadful sin? May it not be true now, as then, that "therefore are there many infirm and weak" among us, "and many sleep" the sleep of death?[2]

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 29. [2] *Ibid.* xi. 30.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE SACRAMENTS

"If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."
Matt. xviii. 17.

WHAT is the signification of the word *sacrament?*

Among profane writers, it has several significations; but, as it is used in the Scriptures and ecclesiastical authors, it is taken for something hidden, a secret;[1] and in general is a visible sign of some holy thing.

In what other sense are the sacraments of the new law a sign?

St. Thomas says they are commemorative of Christ's passion and merit, demonstrative of grace present, and prognostic of future glory.

What is a sign, and how many sorts of signs are there?

A sign, in general, is what puts us in mind of something else; of which there are two kinds, one natural, the other arbitrary. For instance, smoke is a natural sign of fire; the rainbow is a sign of God's promise that there should not be another deluge.[2] Some signs are efficacious, accomplishing what they signify; others, speculative. Of the first kind are the sacraments which produce grace; of the second kind was the brazen serpent, representing Christ's crucifixion.

What is properly a sacrament of the new law?

It is a sensible sign of inward invisible grace, instituted by Christ for man's sanctification.[3]

Can Christ alone institute sacraments?

[1] *Bonum est sacramentum regis abscondere.* "It is good to hide the secret of the king." Tobias xii. 7.

[2] Genesis ix.

[3] "A sensible sign instituted by Christ to give grace." Catechism.

As Christ is the only Author of grace, so he only can ordain signs that are capable of producing grace.

What has the Council of Trent defined concerning Christ being the Author of the sacraments?

That Jesus Christ immediately instituted them, though such a power might have been given to his Church instrumentally.

What sort of sacrament was St. John Baptist's baptism?

The Council of Trent defines, it had not the same effect with the baptism of Christ.

Are not holy water, blessed bread, and other consecrated things, sacraments?

No, we call them *sacramentals*, or signs only of holiness. They give not sanctifying grace, but only actual grace, as being outward parts of prayer; they cause not actual grace by their own force, nor has man power to assign actual grace to such things.

Were there no sacraments before the law of grace? Which were they, and what effect had they?

The divine worship always required the use of visible signs suitable to the state man lived in.

What sacraments belonged to the law of nature?

The sacrifices, and other outward tokens signifying a belief in the Messiah.

What sacraments belonged to the law of Moses?

They were very numerous, namely, circumcision, the paschal lamb, ordination of priests; and in general all their sacrifices were signs of what would happen under the law of grace.

What effect had those sacraments?

They were only speculative signs of sanctifying grace: yet they conferred a legal sanctity, which consecrated the performers so far as to make them obedient to the law of Moses.

What are we to believe as to the matter and form of the sacraments, and how are they to be conceived?

Eugenius IV, in his decree in the Council of Florence, which was held in the year 1439, declares that every sacrament requires a minister, matter, form, and intention of doing what the Church does.

What is Calvin's opinion concerning the form of sacraments?

He pretends the words are not consecratory, but only concionatory or instructive, and serve only to nourish the faith of the receiver: an opinion condemned by the Council of Trent, and manifestly false, as appears in the sacrament of baptism, where the infant has no faith and is incapable of instruction.

Were the matter and form of the sacraments determined and specified by Christ?

Most of them were specified. Yet several divines are of opinion that the matter and form of ordination were only determined in general, it being left to the Church to specify the particular matter and form; which always were to be such as expressed the power that was given. Whereby these divines easily reconcile the rituals of ancient times among the Latins, and the difference between the Greek and Latin rituals, where there is some variety in the matter and form. According to these divines, though Christ appointed the contract to be the matter of the sacrament of matrimony, yet the Church has a power to specify the nature of the contract: as the Council of Trent did by declaring clandestine contracts, which before were only unlawful, to be afterward null and void.

Is it lawful to change the matter and form of the sacraments? And in what cases is it forbidden or allowed?

An essential variation makes the sacrament invalid. Now, a variation is essential if a different matter is made use of, or the sense of the form altered: but if the alteration happen only in the ceremonies, it is only accidental, and destroys not the sacrament; for instance, the form of baptism is valid in any language: as also if, through ignorance of the Latin tongue, one should say, *Ego te baptizo in nomine patris, et filio, et spiritus sanctus*, instead of *Ego te baptizo in nomine patris, et filii, et spiritus sancti.* If there be a doubt of the form, it is to be repeated conditionally.

Who are the ministers of the sacraments?

Only bishops and priests, by their office; though the laity in some cases are the ministers: as, for instance, a layman, in case of

necessity, where a priest is not to be had; as also heretics, schismatics, etc., may validly baptize, if they make use of the true matter and form, and intend to do what the Church does, as it is defined in several councils against the Donatists. Neither is the state of grace requisite to the validity of the sacrament in the minister, as it is defined against Wickliffe. Women may also baptize validly and lawfully in case of necessity. But a parent should not baptize his or her own child if any one else can be found to do it.

Are ministers the causes of grace in the sacraments?

They are only the instruments. The sacraments have their efficacy—i. e., produce grace—from Christ's precious blood.

Does the minister sin mortally if he administers a sacrament in the state of mortal sin?

Yes, but the ritual says that if he has not an opportunity of confessing, he is to make an act of contrition.

What if the minister is in the state of mortal sin, can a person receive a sacrament from him?

In extreme necessity he may; he may also, without extreme necessity, if the minister is not denounced by the Church; and even then, if there is any urgent occasion: but if there is no urgent occasion, he coöperates with the sin; yet care must be taken not to judge rashly of the minister's state.

What intention is required in the minister? What effects do the sacraments produce? In what manner do they produce grace? What is the proper grace of every sacrament? What number of sacraments are there in the new law?

In the first place, intention, in general, is a volition, or act of determining of a thing by the means; it is requisite to every rational action, and much more to every religious action.

How many kinds of intention are men capable of?

Chiefly three, namely: Actual, which is accompanied with an actual attention of the mind to the thing we are about. A virtual intention is when the actual intention is judged to remain in its force, by not being expressly retracted, or interrupted by too long a time. An habitual intention is the facility of performing a thing

obtained by habit or custom, without any actual reflection, or virtual influence, upon the work.

Apply these matters to the ministers of the sacraments?

An actual intention is most desirable; a virtual intention is sufficient; an habitual intention is not sufficient.

In what cases is there a defect of a sufficient intention?

If a minister performs the work in a ludicrous manner, if he retracts his intention, if he is asleep, drunk, or mad, he has either no intention, or only an habitual one.

Is it necessary to intend the effect of the sacrament?

No; otherwise heretics and pagans could not baptize validly. It is sufficient to have an intention of doing what the Church of Christ does, without considering which is the true Church.

What intention is required in those who receive the sacraments?

At least an habitual intention, and generally actual or virtual intention, that they may receive lawfully. Yet there is something particular in the case of extreme unction, when an interpretative intention is sufficient, according to the practice of the Church.

Are not dispositions required in the receivers?

Yes, several: as faith in some, and charity in others; not that the sacrament is not given without them, but that grace is not given without them.

What benefit has the receiver who partakes of a sacrament without due dispositions?

He receives the character in the three sacraments of baptism, confirmation, and orders, though not the particular sacramental grace; which, however, is bestowed upon him when the fiction or impediment is removed by true penance (at the same time he is supposed, when he receives the said sacraments, to have the general dispositions for the character, namely, intention, etc.). This recovering of the sacramental grace is expressly asserted by St. Augustine, and is the opinion of the Church.

What is particularly to be observed concerning those who receive the sacraments?

First, as to infants, no dispositions are required. As to adult

persons, several dispositions are required to make the sacraments valid, namely, intention and consent; other dispositions are required in the adult to receive the effect, namely, sanctifying grace, faith, contrition or attrition, etc.

What effect have the sacramentals—that is, exorcisms, crossing, agnus Dei, holy water, etc.—and how do they produce their effects?

The chief effects are: pious thoughts, or actual grace; the remission of venial sin by means of such grace; the remission of temporal pain; driving away temptations and the devil; restoring to corporal health. But these effects are not infallibly produced by virtue of the sacramentals alone: so that they produce their effects, as being an outward part of the prayers of the Church, and of the pious prayers of those who make use of them.

You say the sacraments produce grace. In what manner is this done? Do they all produce the same sort of grace?

They all produce grace in the nature of channels or vehicles, where Christ is as principal, the minister as joint instrument, the elements as separate instruments. As to the grace conferred, it is different in most of the sacraments: some confer the first grace, or sanctifying grace, as baptism and penance, and they are called the sacraments of the dead; others confer an increase of sanctifying grace, and are called the sacraments of the living, as are all the rest of the sacraments. All the sacraments confer sacramental grace.

Give me a distinct account of the specific or sacramental grace conferred by each of the sacraments?

The grace of baptism is regenerative; it remits original sin, entitles to the name of Christian, and gives a right to partake of the other sacraments. The grace of confirmation is strengthening, and gives courage to profess the true faith. The grace of the Holy Eucharist is nutritive, and unites us to Christ. The grace of penance is remissive of actual sins, and occasions sorrow for them and protection against a relapse. The grace of extreme unction strengthens the sick person against temptations at that time, and procures health. The grace of orders disposes the ministry

to perform their functions with spiritual profit. The grace of matrimony enables the parties to comply with the duties of their state.

Is not a character the effect of some of the sacraments, and what are the properties belonging to it?

A character is a spiritual mark impressed on the soul, whereby a person is distinguished from others, and made capable of receiving and giving other sacraments, and performing what belongs to the divine worship.

Which are the properties of the sacramental character?

It is given only in three sacraments, namely, baptism, confirmation, and holy orders. It is indelible, remaining on the soul after death. It is a quality distinct from the soul, but some divines say the contrary.

How many sacraments are there in the new law?

Seven, namely, baptism, confirmation, Holy Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, holy orders, and matrimony. The divine will was the chief reason of the number. But there is a certain analogy between a corporal and a spiritual life. A Christian is born spiritually by baptism; the spiritual life is increased and strengthened by confirmation; it is nourished by the Eucharist; when sick, it is purged by penance; when dangerously ill, it is restored by extreme unction; economy is preserved in spiritual matters by orders; the species is preserved by marriage, and grace given to answer the ends of that state.

Why do the Scriptures and ancient fathers never mention the number of the sacraments to be seven?

They never mention the number to be two; it is sufficient to mention the things. So the Scriptures never mention that there are twelve principal articles of our belief, to which all the rest are reduced; neither do they ever mention the word Trinity or consubstantiality. There was no occasion to mention the number until the dispute arose, and this it was which made the Church mention the number, which she defined in the general councils of Florence and Trent.

Do not the number of orders—namely, episcopacy, priesthood, deaconship, etc.—increase the number of sacraments?

No; they are all resolved into priesthood, which is the plenitude of orders; all the others are, as it were, species or branches of priesthood.

What do you say as to the dignity and necessity of the sacraments respectively?

It is defined by the Council of Trent that they are not all equal in dignity, and that the Eucharist is the most excellent, as being the fountain of all grace. As to the necessity, it is defined by the Council of Trent that they are necessary to salvation, but some in one manner, and some in another. For instance, baptism is absolutely necessary for all. Baptism and penance are necessary for the adult, either actually or in desire. Matrimony is necessary that we may have Christian homes and Christian society. Orders are necessary for those who perform the sacerdotal functions. The Eucharist, confirmation, and extreme unction are necessary, according to the precepts of God and his Church, at certain times, but not absolutely, when not obtainable.

As there are a great number of ceremonies made use of in administering the sacraments, let me have your opinion of them?

Ceremonies are external performances, made use of either by Christ, the apostles, or the Church afterward; not essential to the sacraments, but instituted for decency, and to promote devotion.

Is it lawful for any particular person to alter the ceremonies?

No, if they are approved of and practised by the whole Church, and handed down by tradition from the earliest times of Christianity; because these are supposed to have been in use from Christ and his apostles.

Is it not superstition to make use of ceremonies?

By no means. Superstition is to make use of outward performances, expecting blessings from them, which neither nature nor appointment can promise or produce. The ceremonies the Church makes use of are in the nature of prayer, of which they are a part. Now, God has annexed certain blessings to prayer.

But are not many of the ceremonies ridiculous, and a hindrance to true devotion by their number?

Not at all. They are significative, and represent all the pious duties of the Christian religion; and if any appear ridiculous, the Church takes care to retrench them, and reform herself in all matters of discipline.

BAPTISM

What is baptism?

It is an exterior washing of the body, under a certain form of words; or thus: it is the first and most necessary sacrament, instituted by Christ to free us from original sin and all actual sin committed before baptism; it makes us children of God and his Church; it is the first sacrament, because before it no other sacrament can be validly received; it is the most necessary, for unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.[1]

How many sorts of baptism are there?

We commonly reckon three, namely, baptism of water, of desire, and of blood; but the first only is properly a sacrament.

What is the baptism of desire, and what effects has it?

It is a true contrition, with an ardent desire of baptism, if it cannot be otherwise obtained; it remits both original and actual sin, but not always the temporal pain due to sin.

What is the baptism of blood, and what are its effects?

It is a martyrdom, and remits original and actual sin, with all the temporal pain. Hence the holy innocents are esteemed martyrs, as being baptized in their own blood.

When was the sacrament of baptism instituted by Christ, and when were Christians first obliged to receive it?

It was instituted before Christ's Passion; some holy fathers and divines say it was instituted when Christ was baptized by St. John; others, when Christ said, "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of

[1] John iii. 5.

ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

FROM THE PAINTING BY GUIDO RENI

God."[1] St. Augustine says Christ baptized the apostles; but be this as it will, it is certain they baptized all persons, after the ascension of our Saviour, according to the commission they received from Jesus Christ when he said, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost";[2] and that the obligation then began as the Gospel was promulgated.

Which is the essential matter of baptism?

Natural water, as it is defined by the Council of Trent; so that artificial water, or other liquids, are not a proper matter. It must also be applied by ablution, so that ice, unless dissolved, is not sufficient: besides, the water ought to be consecrated according to the Ritual; but this is not absolutely necessary, only upon account of the precept.

After how many ways may this ablution be performed?

Three: first, by immersion, that is, plunging or dipping the body; secondly, by infusion or effusion, that is, pouring on; thirdly, by aspersion upon some particular part. It is probable the apostles baptized by aspersion or effusion, because three thousand were baptized in one day.[3] Yet in the primitive ages the practice was to baptize by three immersions, which the Church has altered to three infusions. One infusion is sufficient, as to the validity of the sacrament, as also without making the sign of the cross.

Which is the form of baptism, and how is it to be explained?

The necessary form is these words: I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Some add the word, Amen, but it is not in the Roman Ritual. Again, we are to baptize in the name, as St. Augustine says, and not in the names. Neither is baptism valid in the name of Christ, in the name of God, or in the name of the Trinity, because they do not express the mystery, and tradition requires a distinct signification. Again, it is to be observed that the same person who applies the matter must pronounce the form, otherwise the baptism is invalid.

[1] John iii. 5. [2] Matt. xxviii. 19. [3] Acts ii. 41.

Why are the apostles in the Scripture said to have baptized in the name of Christ?[1]

St. Cyprian and other fathers say that in the name of Christ signifies by the authority of Christ; but that they at the same time made use of the distinct form. St. Thomas, as also the Roman catechism, say, if the name of Christ was only made use of, it was by a particular dispensation, to the end that the power of Christ might particularly be established at that time.

Is it necessary to salvation that all persons, even infants, should be baptized?

It is absolutely necessary for all adult persons to be actually baptized, if they can; or in desire, where it cannot be actually obtained. As for infants, they are to be actually baptized, as is defined against the Pelagians, and since against the Calvinists, by the Council of Trent. This doctrine is grounded upon the words of our Saviour Christ, where he says, "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."[2]

Is baptism to be deferred until infants are able to answer for themselves?

No; the contrary is defined, against the Anabaptists, by the Council of Trent.

Is a child half born to be baptized?

If life appear, it may: if life be doubtful, the Ritual orders baptism under condition. The same Ritual orders the baptism of a monster under condition.

Which are the effects of baptism?

A total remission of original and actual sin, with the pains due to them. Hence, no satisfaction is appointed when adult persons are baptized. Again, all spiritual and supernatural gifts are given at the same time. It is an entire regeneration, or new life; it gives a right to all the other sacraments; it opens the gates to heaven; it gives a character, and cannot be reiterated. All these points are defined by the Council of Trent.

[1] Acts viii. 12. [2] John iii. 5.

What is to be said concerning the minister and place of baptism?

Every man is a minister in case of necessity—that is to say, when a priest cannot be had—using the true matter and form, with an intention of doing what the Church does: but only the bishop or parish priest is the proper minister by office, or one deputed by the ordinary. Hence chaplains are not to baptize by office, nor superiors of religious orders. And there is a regulation to be observed when there is urgent necessity, namely, a man is to be preferred to a woman, and those in higher orders to those in lesser. As to place, the Ritual orders it to be in the church, unless in princes' children, and even then it is to be done in an oratory, and the water fetched from the parish church.

Is it lawful to receive baptism more than once?

No, it is not lawful to receive it, upon any account, more than once.[1] And the reason is because it imprints a spiritual character in the soul which shall remain forever, either to our great joy in heaven, or our confusion in hell.

What is the penalty for rebaptizing?

By the old civil law, it was death; and now, by the canons of the Church, it is irregularity, and otherwise punishable.

What is required of him who has a mind to receive baptism?

It is required of him, and he promises to God, to renounce the devil, his works, his pomps, and all his vanities. Moreover, it is necessary for him who is come to the use of reason before he receives baptism, to have faith, a true and hearty sorrow and detestation for all his sins, and to begin to love God.

What do you understand by the works, pomps, and vanities of the devil?

By the works of the devil we understand all kinds of sin. By the pomps and vanities of the devil we understand vainglory, suggestions of the devil, worldly ambition, and every other kind of pride.

[1] Heb. vi. 4, 6.

For what end are godfathers and godmothers appointed us, and what is the discipline of the Church as to this point?

That they may answer for and instruct us, in case our parents should die or be wanting or negligent in that part of their duty; which obligation lies on them. At present, since the Council of Trent, there is to be only one godfather and one godmother, and no more; and they ought both to be Catholics, and of a good reputation. According to the Council of Trent, a spiritual affinity is contracted between the baptized and the sponsors, as also between the father and mother of the baptized and the sponsors; but not between the sponsors themselves. This affinity is an impediment, not only making marriage unlawful, but also invalid, between the parties. It is also to be noted that he who baptizes the child contracts a spiritual affinity with the child and with the child's parents: but where a child is baptized without the ceremonies, in case of necessity, there is no affinity contracted when the ceremonies are performed afterward; and the reason is because that ceremony is not a sacrament. This is declared by Innocent III.

Are we bound to fulfil all that our godfathers and godmothers have promised in our name?

We certainly are; for it is upon that condition we were admitted to baptism, and were made members of the Church, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven.[1]

What obligation does baptism lay upon us?

First, to believe firmly all that the Catholic Church teaches. Secondly, to keep faithfully all the commandments of God and his Church.[2] And lastly, to follow diligently the example of our Saviour Christ, and his saints.[3]

CONFIRMATION

What is confirmation?

It is a sacrament conferred by a bishop, by imposition of hands and unction with chrism, under a certain form of words, and

[1] Gal. v. 3, 6. [2] Rom. vi. 3, 4. [3] 1 Pet. ii. 21.

instituted to confirm the baptized in the faith of Christ and his Church, and to resist all temptations against it.

What grounds have you to believe it is properly a sacrament?

First, from the Scriptures, where we read, in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter viii, that Peter and John were sent to confirm the Samaritans, by imposition of hands, to receive the Holy Ghost, though they had already been baptized.[1] Secondly, from the holy fathers, who all agree that confirmation is a sacrament.

Do Protestants hold confirmation to be a sacrament?

No; only a ceremony, for instruction of youth in their faith, after they have arrived at the use of reason, and to put them in mind of their baptismal vows. But, though they will not in formal terms call it a sacrament, yet they will own the antiquity and use of it from the apostles' time; and by their Book of Common Prayer it is ordered that " as soon as the children can say, in their mother tongue, the creed, the Lord's Prayer, the ten commandments," etc., they be brought to the bishop, by one that shall be their godfather or godmother, and the bishop shall confirm them, etc.: " forasmuch as confirmation is administered to them who are baptized, that by the imposition of hands and prayer they may receive strength and defence against all temptations to sin, and the assaults of the world and the devil." Now, what is the strength and defence which they receive against the temptations of sin, the world, and the devil, but the grace of God? If, then, they own grace to be given thereby, they ought to own it to be a sacrament, as having all requisites to a sacrament, namely, matter, form, and a proper minister. And it is said in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter viii, that the visible sign of the imposition of hands has annexed to it an invisible grace, namely, the imparting of the Holy Ghost; consequently, confirmation is a visible sign of invisible grace, and therefore is a sacrament.

What is the matter of this sacrament?

Imposition of hands and unction with chrism.

The Scriptures make no mention of unction with chrism?

[1] Heb. vi. 2; 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; Acts xix. 5, 6.

This is known by constant traditions of the primitive fathers, who expressly assert it. The immediate matter is the anointing; the remote matter is the chrism. Both Scripture and fathers make imposition of hands part of the ceremony; as, also, chrism is mentioned by all the fathers. And it is defined by the Council of Trent that virtue is to be ascribed also to the chrism. Some divines think the apostles made use of chrism, otherwise their immediate successors would not have used and imposed it. This opinion seems to be agreeable to St. Paul, where he says, "He that confirmeth us with you in Christ, and he that hath anointed us, is God; who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts." [1]

What is chrism, and why was it assumed for that use?

It is an ointment made of oil of olives and balsam: any other oil is not sufficient matter. Now, oil has several qualities which signify the effect of this sacrament, namely, spiritual strength and purity of conscience, and preservation from rust, that is, from sin; and the sweetness of balsam, the odor of a good life.

Is it requisite that the chrism be consecrated, and that by a bishop?

Yes, it is requisite to the validity of the sacrament; though some divines are of a contrary opinion.

Who is the minister of confirmation?

A bishop is the only ordinary minister, as it is decreed by the General Council of Florence. Besides, the Council of Trent has defined that a bishop is the only ordinary minister; and this appears from the Scripture itself, where we read, in the eighth chapter of the Acts, that Peter and John were sent to confirm the Samaritans. This has been the constant tradition and practice of the Church, as we learn from St. Cyprian, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and others. However, St. Thomas and some other divines hold that the Pope can grant permission to a priest to administer this sacrament, provided he makes use of the chrism consecrated by a bishop: but St. Bonaventure and others think no such dispensation can be granted by the Pope.

[1] 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

What is the form of this sacrament?

It is the prayer made use of to implore the assistance and bestowing of the Holy Ghost, and the words joined with the unction, namely, I sign thee with the sign of the cross, I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Why is no mention made of the aforesaid form of confirmation in the writings of the fathers and ancient rituals?

The fathers purposely declined mentioning the nature of the sacraments, especially the form. As for rituals, the form of words sometimes varied, though it was always a prayer signifying the nature of the sacrament.

What are the particular effects of confirmation?

It bestows, in the first place, an increase of our baptismal grace; it also confers upon us the Holy Ghost, with all his gifts. Again, it gives a particular grace confirming persons in their faith, and protecting them against heresy; a spiritual courage and strength to resist all the visible and invisible enemies of our faith; and, lastly, a character of being soldiers of Christ;[1] which character is indelible, and therefore this sacrament cannot be repeated. Hence, those that are to be confirmed are obliged to be so much the more careful to come to this sacrament worthily, since it can be received but once; and if they then receive it unworthily, they have no share in the grace which is thereby communicated to the soul; instead of which, they incur the guilt of a grievous sacrilege.

Who are capable of receiving confirmation, and what dispositions are required?

In the first place, the person must be baptized. Again, infants are capable, because it was the custom formerly to confirm children immediately after they were baptized; but now, not until the perfect use of reason, and then they are obliged to know the principal articles of their faith, to confess their sins, and, by a true contrition, to be in the state of grace; it is also advisable to receive it fasting, but this is not of strict obligation.

[1] 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

What say you as to the necessity of receiving this sacrament?

It is not of that absolute necessity, but that persons may be saved without it; yet there is a precept for receiving it, which obliges all adult persons, when they have a fit opportunity, or else they are guilty of a mortal sin if it be omitted out of contempt or any gross neglect, and that they foresee they cannot have an opportunity hereafter; or when, as the Ritual expresses, the persons are exposed to dangerous temptations, either inward or outward, of losing their faith; for in such circumstances, they omit the proper means provided by the law of God to resist them.

What ought to be done after receiving confirmation?

We ought to give most hearty thanks to God for the abundance of grace we have received from him; to make a firm resolution to live for Christ, and to profess our faith openly; "for with the heart we believe unto justice, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."[1] We ought earnestly to ask of God the fruits of the Holy Ghost, etc.

What is the obligation that a Christian takes upon him in confirmation?

He lists himself there for a soldier of Christ; and consequently is obliged, after having received this sacrament, to fight manfully the battles of his Lord.

THE EUCHARIST[2]

What is the Holy Eucharist?

It is a sacrament which contains the body and blood, soul and divinity, of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, under the forms and appearances of bread and wine.

By what names is it usually known?

It was called in the primitive Church, and by the holy fathers, Eucharist, which is a Greek word, and signifies "thanksgiving"; and is applied to this sacrament because of the thanksgiving which our Saviour Christ offered in the first institution of it, according to St. Matthew xxvi. 27; St. Mark xiv. 23; St. Luke xxii. 19; and

[1] Rom. x. 9, 10.

[2] See, also, the preceding chapter.

because of the thanksgiving with which we are obliged to offer and receive this great sacrament and sacrifice, which contains the fountain of all grace, the standing memorial of our redemption, and the pledge of a happy eternity. It is called the Lord's Supper because it was instituted by Christ at his last supper. It is called the Viaticum when we receive it, in danger of death, as a source of strength and encouragement on our journey to eternity. It is called the Holy Communion because all partakers are by its reception brought into most intimate communion with Christ Jesus, and made to put on Christ. It is called the Sacrifice, being by immolation offered to God.

Is it a memorial, and of what?

It is, in general, a memorial of love, being the greatest of legacies. It is a memorial of Christ's Passion. It is demonstrative of grace present, and prognostic of future glory.

How does the Eucharist differ from the rest of the sacraments?

First, in dignity; hence it is called the Holy Sacrament. Secondly, it contains the fountain of grace. Thirdly, there is a miraculous conversion, by destroying the matter. Fourthly, it consists not only in use, but in a permanent thing.

What figures were there formerly of the Eucharist, and how did they represent it?

It was prefigured by Melchisedech's offering bread and wine, as to the matter; for Christ was a priest according to the order of Melchisedech. As to the effect, it was prefigured by the manna, which had all sorts of delicious tastes. As to the thing contained, Christ's body that suffered, it was prefigured by all the sacrifices immolated by the law of Moses. Hence Christ is called the " Lamb slain from the beginning of the world." But the most express figure was the killing and eating of the paschal lamb. The blood of the lamb was sprinkled on their doors whom the destroying angel spared. So the blood of Christ is sprinkled to redeem men from sin. Christ, again, is called the innocent Lamb. And the paschal lamb was eaten with unleavened bread.

What is the faith of the Catholic Church concerning this sacrament?

That the substance of bread and wine is changed, by the words of consecration, into the real body and blood of Jesus Christ. That under each form is truly and really the body and blood, as also the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, which by the hypostatical union is inseparable from his body and blood. That whosoever receives under one kind alone, receives whole Christ, as much as if he received under both. That by dividing the species, the body of Christ is not hurt, but remains entire under the least particle.

In what manner is Christ present in this sacrament?

By the true and real presence of his divine and human nature, and not in figure only, as some would have it.

Is the body of Christ present in the Eucharist after a natural, corporeal, and visible manner, as he was upon earth before he suffered?

No; for, according to St. Paul, there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body; so that it may be called a spiritual body in the sense of St. Paul speaking of the resurrection of the body, where he says, "it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body."[1] Not but that it still remains a true body, as to all that is essential to a body; for surely no one will pretend to say that the body of Christ, which is now in heaven, is not the same true and real body which was born of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and which suffered upon the cross. And as Christ's body has now the qualities of a glorified body, as being spiritualized, so it partakes in some measure of the qualities and properties of a spirit. Therefore, it is easier conceived how Christ's body may be in the sacrament without extension or greatness of place; for as a spirit requires no extension for its being, so neither does a body when it is become spiritual and immortal; and since Christ's body is in the Eucharist in the manner of being as it was in after his resurrection, namely, incorruptible, immortal, and impassible ("Christ, rising again from the dead, dieth now no more; death shall no more have dominion over him"[2])—so it is not to be imagined Christ suffers when the sacrament is broken, eaten, and the like. Thus may be conceived how

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 44.

[2] Rom. vi. 9.

THE DESCENT FROM THE CROSS

FROM THE CELEBRATED PAINTING BY RUBENS, IN ANTWERP CATHEDRAL, BELGIUM

Christ's body may be whole and entire in every part after the sacred Host is divided, and also how it may be in many places at once: for though we cannot easily understand this possible to an extended body remaining in its corporeal manner of being, yet there is no such difficulty in relation to a spirit, or any other thing in its manner of being like a spirit; because a spirit has no dependence on place, nor is confined either to it or by it. Neither is it more strange for Christ to be in the blessed sacrament, and at the same time in heaven, than it was for him to be in heaven, and at the same time on earth, when he appeared to St. Paul.[1] Nor, after all, are our senses to guide us in this or in any other mystery of faith; but faith itself, namely, the word of God, of Jesus Christ, who says, "This is my body."[2] His power and truth make it to be what he solemnly asserts; this we believe, as well as all other mysteries, upon his word, proposed unto us by his Church; upon his word we rely, by which he made all things out of nothing, and changes the nature of things when and as he pleases; as when he changed Lot's wife into a pillar of salt;[3] water into blood;[4] as, likewise, water into wine.[5] Neither is the difficulty greater here in believing, upon God's word, against our senses, than in believing, upon God's word, the young man to be an angel,[6] or the dove and fiery tongues to be the Holy Ghost,[7] when to our senses they appear otherwise. God's word makes things infinitely surer to us than our senses; for, alas! how often and easily are our senses deceived? while God's word can never deceive us: we ought, therefore, always to submit to it when we know it to be God's word.

How do you prove from God's word the real presence of the body and blood of Christ to be in this sacrament?

I prove it from no less than four different places in the New Testament, delivered by Christ himself at the time of his instituting this sacrament, namely, from the twenty-sixth chapter of St. Matthew, from the fourteenth of St. Mark, from the twenty-second of St. Luke, and from the eleventh of the First Epistle of St. Paul

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 8. [2] Matt. xxvi. 26. [3] Genesis xix. [4] Exod. vii.
[5] John ii. 9. [6] Mark xvi.; Matt. xxviii. [7] Matt. iii.; Acts ii.

to the Corinthians; in all these places Christ himself assures us that what he gives us in the blessed sacrament is his own body and blood.

First, in the twenty-sixth chapter of St. Matthew we read, verses 26, 27: "And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to his disciples; and said, Take ye and eat: this is my body. And taking the chalice, he gave thanks; and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins."

Secondly, in the fourteenth chapter of St. Mark we read, verses 22, 23, 24: "And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessing, broke, and gave to them, and said, Take ye, this is my body. And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And he said to them, This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many."

Thirdly, in the twenty-second chapter of St. Luke we read, verses 19, 20: "And taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner [he took] the chalice also, after he had supped, saying, This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."

Fourthly, in the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians we read, verses 23, 24, 25: "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, the night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, broke, and said, Take ye, and eat: this is my body which shall be delivered for you: do this for the commemoration of me. In like manner also [he took] the chalice, after he had supped, saying, This chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink it for the commemoration of me."

Why do you take these words of Christ, at his Last Supper, according to the letter, rather than in a figurative sense?

I have many reasons to offer why we take the words of Christ which he spoke at his Last Supper in their plain and literal sense.

First, because whatever Christ has plainly and expressly said in Scripture ought to be understood by us in the literal and proper sense of the words, where the case will admit of it: this is what our adversaries themselves either do or must allow; otherwise, it is not possible to prove by Scripture that any one text of the Gospel ought to be taken literally and properly. Now, it is certain that Christ has plainly and expressly said in the Scripture that what he instituted at his Last Supper was the same body and blood which he gave for the life of the world: and there is no doubt but that the body which he gave and sacrificed for us, and the blood which he shed for us, was his true and real body and blood: Christ, says St. Paul, gave himself for his Church.[1] And in another place St. Paul says that Christ entered by his own blood into the sanctuary.[2] Therefore, the words of Christ which he spoke at his Last Supper, in the institution of the blessed sacrament, ought to be taken in the literal and proper sense of the words. Secondly, when God speaks in the holy Scripture with an express design to make known to us some new institution or command upon which our salvation depends, or to discover some high mystery of faith which was entirely new to the world, and which was necessary for the world to know, but could not be known only from his words—then, if ever, we have good reason to believe the word of God speaks plainly, and ought to be taken in the natural and literal sense of the words: now, here our Saviour spoke those words, "This is my body," "This is my blood," at the institution of a great sacrament upon which our salvation depends, with an express design to reveal a high mystery of faith which was entirely new to the world, and which was necessary for the world to know, but could not be known to his disciples only from his words. We conclude, then, that his words upon such an occasion ought in all reason to be understood in the plain, obvious, and literal sense, especially since there is no absurdity or contradiction in the literal sense which can oblige us to have recourse to a figurative meaning; since there is nothing in the belief of the real presence but what is clearly within the sphere

[1] Ephesians v. 26. [2] Hebrews ix. 12.

of infinite power; nay, it is an easier thing to comprehend that God can change one thing into another, than make all things out of nothing, as he did the world. Thirdly, because Christ was at that time making a covenant which was to last to the end of the world. He was enacting a law which was to be forever observed in his Church. He was instituting a sacrament which was to be frequented by all the faithful. In fine, he was making his last will and testament, and therein bequeathing to his disciples, and to us all, an admirable legacy and pledge of his love. Now, such is the nature of all these things—namely, of a covenant, of a law, of a sacrament, of a last will and testament—that he who makes a covenant, a law, a last will and testament, etc., always designs that what he covenants, appoints, or ordains should be rightly observed and fulfilled; so, of consequence, he always designs that it should be rightly understood, and therefore he always expresses himself in the most plain and clear terms. This is what all wise men ever observe in their covenants, laws, or last wills, industriously avoiding all obscure expressions, which may give occasion to their being misunderstood. This is what God himself observed in the old covenant, in all the ceremonies and moral precepts of the law: all are expressed in the most clear and plain terms. It, then, can be nothing less than impeaching the wisdom of the Son of God to imagine that he should institute the chief of all his sacraments under such a form of words, which in their plain, natural, and obvious meaning imply a thing so widely different from what he gives therein, as his own body is from a bit of bread; or, in fine, to believe that he would make his last will and testament in words affectedly ambiguous and obscure; which, if taken according to that sense which they seem evidently to express, must lead his children into a pernicious error concerning the legacy which he bequeaths them. In effect, it is certain that our Saviour Christ foresaw that his words would be taken according to the letter by the greatest part of Christians; and that the Church, even in her general councils, would interpret his words in this sense. It must, then, be contrary to all probability that he, who foresaw all this, would affect to express himself in

this manner in his last will, had he not really meant what he said; or that he should not have somewhere explained himself in a more clear way, to prevent the dreadful consequence of his whole Church's authorizing an error in a matter of the greatest importance; particularly when he was then speaking alone to his beloved apostles and bosom friends, to whom he was always accustomed to explain in clear terms (as St. Mark assures us) whatever was obscure in his parables or other discourses to the people.[1] Fourthly, because I have the authority of the best and most authentic interpreter of God's word, namely, the holy Catholic Church, which has always understood these words of Christ in their plain literal sense, and condemned all those who have presumed to wrest them to a figurative one: witness the many synods held against Berengarius, and the decrees of the general councils of Lateran, Constance, and Trent. Now, against this authority, the Scripture assures us, the gates of hell shall never prevail.[2] And with this interpreter Christ has promised that he and the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, will abide for ever.[3]

But are not many of Christ's sayings to be understood figuratively, as when he says, "I am the door," "I am the true vine," etc.? Why, then, may not the words of the institution of the Last Supper be also understood figuratively?

It is a very bad argument to pretend to infer that, because some of Christ's words are to be taken figuratively, therefore all are to be taken so. At this rate, an Arian might pretend that when our Saviour in Holy Scripture is called God, and the Son of God, it is only figuratively, because he is in other places figuratively called a door, a vine. There is a manifold disparity between the case of the expressions you mention—namely, "I am the door," "the true vine," etc.—and the words of the Last Supper, "This is my body," "This is my blood." First, because the former are delivered as parables and similitudes, and consequently as figures; the latter are the words of a covenant, sacrament, and last will, and therefore are to be understood according to their most plain and

[1] Mark iv. 11, 34. [2] Matt. xvi. 18. [3] *Ibid.* xx.; John xiv.

obvious meaning. Secondly, because the former are explained by Christ himself, in the same place, in a figurative sense, but the latter are not. Thirdly, because the former are worded in such a manner as to carry with them the evidence of a figure, so that no man alive can possibly take them in any other than a figurative meaning—for who will pretend to say that our Saviour was really a door or a vine?—but the latter so evidently imply the literal sense, that they who have been the most desirous to find a figure in them have been puzzled to do it. This was the case of Luther himself, as we learn from his epistle to his friends at Strasburg; and of Zwingli, as we learn from his epistle to Pomeranus.

But may not the sign or figure be called by the name of the thing signified? And have we not instances of this in Scripture?

In certain cases, when a thing is already known to be a sign or figure of something else, which it signifies or represents, it may indeed be said, according to the common laws of speech and the use of the Scripture, to be such or such a thing—that is, it signifies or represents such a thing; as in the interpretation of parables, ancient figures, and the like. But it is not the same in the first institution of a sign or figure, because when a thing is not known beforehand to be a sign or representation of some other thing, to call it abruptly by a foreign name would be contrary to all laws of speech, and both absurd and unintelligible, as if you should say that a morsel of bread is London Bridge or that a bit of cheese is Canterbury church because by an act of memory they put you in mind of those buildings; but this would be justly censured as nonsensical and unworthy of a wise man: just so it would have been if our blessed Saviour at his Last Supper, without acquainting his disciples beforehand that he designed to speak figuratively, should have abruptly told them, " This is my body," " This is my blood," had he not meant that they were really so. For abstracting from the change which Christ was pleased to make in the elements by his almighty word, a bit of bread has no more similitude to Christ's body than a morsel of bread has to London Bridge; so that nothing but the real presence of Christ's body and blood could verify his

words at his Last Supper, or vindicate them from being highly absurd and unworthy the Son of God.

But do not these words which our Saviour spoke—namely, "Do this for a commemoration of me"[1]—determine his other words to a figurative sense? For the remembrance or commemoration of a thing supposes it to be absent.

These words, "Do this for a commemoration of me," inform us, indeed, of the end for which we are to offer up and receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ, namely, for a perpetual commemoration of his death and passion, as St. Paul teaches us;[2] but they no ways interfere with those other words, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," so as to explain away the real presence of Christ's body and blood. It is certain St. Matthew and St. Mark never looked upon those words, "Do this for a commemoration of me," as a necessary explication of the words of the institution, "This is my body." "This is my blood," as any ways altering or qualifying the natural and literal meaning of them; since they have in their Gospels quite omitted those words, "Do this for a commemoration of me." As to what you allege, that the remembrance of a thing supposes it to be absent, I answer that whatsoever things we may be liable to forget, whether really present or really absent, may be the object of our remembrance; for what can be more intimately present to us than God, and yet the Scripture commands us to remember our Creator,[3] though in him we live, move, and have our being.[4] So that this command of remembering Christ is no ways opposed to his real presence: but the most that can be inferred from it is that he is not visibly present—which is very true—and therefore, lest we should forget him, this remembrance is enjoined.

But notwithstanding all that has been said, is it not the greatest absurdity, and even blasphemy, to say that a man can make his God, or that a priest can turn a wafer or a bit of bread into his Saviour?

It never was the belief of the Catholic Church that the bread

[1] Luke xxii. 19. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 26. [3] Eccles. xii. 1. [4] Acts xvii. 28.

is changed by the priest into the body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. We believe, indeed, as I have already said, that by the almighty power of God, making use of the ministry of the priest, the bread is changed into the body of Christ: but we neither do nor ever did believe and teach that the bread, which is a material substance, is changed into the soul, which is a spirit; much less do we believe and teach that it is changed into the divinity; nay, we believe it to be blasphemy and heresy to imagine any such thing. We believe, it is true, that the body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ are truly and really present in the blessed sacrament, and that Christ is contained whole and entire under either kind: not that the bread and wine are changed into Christ's soul or divinity; but that the bread and wine are only changed or converted into his body and blood; however, by the natural connection by which Christ's body and blood (which is now risen from the dead, to die no more) is always accompanied with the soul, and the divinity with both body and soul, by reason of the hypostatical union of the divine and human nature in Christ, we therefore believe that Christ's soul and divinity are also present, not by change or conversion, but by concomitance. Therefore it is not our belief that a priest can make his God, etc.

Have you anything more to add by way of proof out of Scripture, in favor of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the blessed sacrament?

Yes, I have several more strong proofs, as, first, from the words of Christ spoken to the Jews in the sixth chapter of St. John; and secondly, from the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, the tenth and eleventh chapters; thirdly, from the ancient figures of the Eucharist, which demonstrate that there is something more noble in it than bread and wine, taken only in remembrance of Christ; fourthly, from the unerring authority of the Church in her decisions in relation to this controversy.

Besides these arguments from Scripture and Church authority, have you anything else to allege in proof of the real presence?

THE BODY OF JESUS RESTING IN THE LAP OF HIS MOTHER

FROM THE PAINTING BY SIR ANTHONY VAN DYCK

Yes, first, the authority of all the ancient fathers, whose plain testimonies may be seen in an appendix to a book entitled "A Specimen of the Spirit of the Dissenting Teachers," etc. Secondly, the perpetual consent of the Greeks and all the Oriental Christians, demonstrated by Monsieur Arnaud and others in a book entitled "La Perpétuité de la Foi," etc., and confirmed by the authentic testimonies of their patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots, etc.; by the writings of their ancient and modern divines, and by all their liturgies; and even acknowledged by many Protestant writers.[1] Now, what can be a more convincing evidence of this doctrine's having been handed down by tradition from the apostles, than to see all sorts of Christians, who have any pretensions to antiquity, agreeing in it? Thirdly, both ancient and modern Church history furnishes us with many instances of miracles, the best attested, which from time to time have been wrought in testimony of this same truth, of which in divers parts of Christendom there are standing monuments to this day. My last proof is from the doctrine of the Church of England, as it is delivered in her catechism, which is printed in the common prayer-book, which acknowledges that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. This is the doctrine of the Church of England, which expresses the real and substantial presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, as fully as any Catholic can do: for if "verily and indeed" be not the same as "really and truly," and of as full force to exclude a mere figurative presence, I confess I am yet wholly ignorant of the signification even of the most common words; and it will be impossible to know what men mean, even when they deliver themselves in the plainest terms. So that it must either be owned that the words of Christ's institution import a real and substantial presence of his body and blood, even according to Protestant doctrine, or we must suppose the Church of England guilty of a most scandalous equiv-

[1] See Sir Edwin Sandys's Relation of the Religion of the West, p. 233; Dr. Potter's Answer to Charity Mistaken, p. 225; Bishop Forbes on the Eucharist; Dr. Nicholai, Of the Kingdom of Christ, etc.

ocation or gross contradiction; for how that can be verily and indeed taken and received which is not verily and indeed there, is a greater mystery than transubstantiation.

You have satisfied me as to this point: but pray what is the doctrine of the Church concerning the matter of this sacrament?

The matter is bread and wine, namely, wheaten bread, and wine of the grape, which Christ made use of; and without them the consecration is not valid.

Why are bread and wine made use of?

It is, in the first place, the divine will. Again, by reason of the analogy, with respect to the end and effect. They signify a spiritual nourishment. They represent Christ's Passion, or separation of his blood from his body.

Is bread to be leavened or unleavened?

It is certain that Christ used unleavened bread, because he celebrated the Last Supper on the first day of the Azyms, or unleavened bread: see St. Matthew xxvi. 7, 17; St. Mark xiv. 12; St. Luke xxii. 7, when the Jews were forbid, under pain of death (as we read in Exodus xii. 15, etc.), to eat any leavened bread for those seven days; nay, they were even forbid to keep it in their houses. However, there is no divine precept. Hence the Greek Church is allowed to consecrate in leavened bread.

Is water to be mixed with the wine?

Yes, by the Church precept, and, it is probable, after Christ's example. Water represents the water which flowed from our Saviour's side: not but that consecration without water is valid.

Is the consecration valid in wine only, or bread only?

Yes; but there is a divine precept not to separate them—from these words of Christ, "Do this for a commemoration of me,"[1] etc. Besides, unless they are consecrated together, they do not represent Christ's Passion distinctly.

What is the form of this sacrament?

The sufficient and necessary form of the consecration of bread are these words: "This is my body"; of wine, "This is the chalice

[1] Luke xxii.; 1 Cor. x.

of my blood, of the new and everlasting testament, a mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, to the remission of sins." The prayer, and words before and after, are only necessary by reason of the Church precept. These forms are known by the Scripture and constant doctrine of the fathers: for, as the catechism of the Council of Trent argues, "*Do this*" falls upon the words as well as upon the signification.

What is transubstantiation?

Literally, a change of substance; in our present application it is the conversion or change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.

In what manner is this performed? Is the substance of bread and wine annihilated? Is Christ's body created anew, or does it forsake heaven?

No: it is done by a total change of one substance into the other, by the almighty power of God, to whom nothing is hard or impossible; who daily changes bread and wine, by digestion, into our body and blood.

How can there be a change of substances, seeing that, on one hand, the bread and wine still remain in their natural properties, namely, their quality, extension, color, and taste; they are tangible, they retain their usual property of nourishing—nay, they are subject to corruption? Are Christ's body and blood subject to these affections? Are they extended, are they seen, touched, can they be moved, or are they subject to corruption?

What appears to the senses is not the substance, but only the accidents of bread and wine; and even local extension is not essential to a body: so that, though the substance of bread and wine is changed, they still retain their natural properties under the new substance into which they are miraculously changed. Now, these properties, which are still retained, belong not to Christ's body and blood immediately, but are the accidents of the former substance. Hence extension, motion, visibility, tangibility, nourishment, and corruption are not ascribed in Christ's body and blood, only indirectly, and in appearance.

By this transubstantiation the evidence of all our senses, and reason too, seems to be destroyed, which God bestowed upon rational creatures as a rule or guide to judge of all matters whatever; so that they cannot be deceived without injury to the divine goodness and veracity in providing us with a deceitful guide.

The senses are commonly the mediums of true information, but in no cases the judges; judgment being an act of the understanding. However, the senses sometimes deceive us both in natural and supernatural things. For instance, our sight gives false information concerning the size of the celestial bodies, that the stars are no bigger than walnuts, and the sun no bigger than a plate, when at the same time they are bigger than the whole earth. The senses all gave a wrong information concerning the divine nature of Christ, as also that he who appeared to the women in the monument was a man, although the Scripture says he was an angel.[1] In the same manner, the reasoning faculty is not a true judge when it is under the direction of ignorance, passion, malice, etc. There is a distinction to be made between the faculty of reason and the right use of it. For instance, the faculty of reason is a false informer when it pretends to penetrate into the mysteries of faith. Hence, both the senses and reasoning, though in other things true informers, yet in mysteries of faith are liable to mistake, as in the Trinity; so that, though our senses speak bread and wine; faith and reason, rightly made use of, correct their information: for to say you would believe your senses rather than God is blasphemy.

Do not miracles entirely depend upon the testimony of the senses? Why, then, shall we not believe that to be only bread where all our senses declare it to be so?

We believe not miracles purely upon the testimony of the senses, but from reason. But the case is not parallel. In miracles there is no contrary circumstance or precept to deny their information; but in the Eucharist we are to believe Christ's words, which are inconsistent with the information of sense. In many

[1] Mark xvi.; Matt. xxviii.

cases all our senses are wrong informers, as reason tells us; and why should we depend upon them when both faith and reason inform us of their misrepresentation?

When Christ changed water into wine, the people judged there was the substance from the qualities it had of wine. If, therefore, bread retains the same qualities, we may conclude it has the substance?

The case is not parallel. The testimony of the senses was sufficient to convince them it was true wine, since there was no circumstance or words made use of by Christ to signify there were only the accidents or species of wine in the substance of water. Now, in the Eucharist, the words of Christ, "This is my body," cannot be verified if the substance of bread remained; otherwise, our Saviour should have said, "In this bread is my body, and in this wine is my blood": but as our Saviour said no such thing, but, on the contrary, absolutely declared that what he gave to his apostles was his body, in this latter case the senses cannot be true informers.

By what power is this change made, and why is it called transubstantiation, seeing there is no such word in the Scriptures? And why may not the Lutherans' opinion be allowed, who affirm there is consubstantiation—that is, that both the substance of bread, and Christ's body, are present?

We have it by constant tradition that the change is made by the words pronounced in consecration, whereby God himself acts as principal, and the priests as instrumental, in the person of Christ; and therefore the priest does not say, "This is the body of Christ"; but "This is my body." It is true, there is no such word as transubstantiation in the Scripture, in express terms, but only equivalently; and therefore the Council of Trent says it is a proper word to express that mystery. In the same manner, there are no such words in the Scripture as consubstantiation, Trinity, person, or original sin, but all are found there equivalently. As for consubstantiation, condemned by the Council of Trent against the Lutherans, it does not verify Christ's words; for then he should

have said, "Here is my body." So there is a necessity of a change by transubstantiation. This is what many learned Protestants have urged against Luther and his followers.[1]

Is not the Eucharist often called bread after the consecration? And why, if it is not really bread?

It is still called bread, and nothing can be more agreeable to the common practice of men and the rules of speech. First, because it has to our senses all the natural appearances and effects of bread and wine: for this reason, angels, in the Scripture, are called men.[2] Secondly, because it was bread and wine before consecration. Thus God said to Adam, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou must return."[3] Aaron's rod, which was changed into a serpent,[4] is still called a rod, because made from it. Thirdly, it is called bread because it is the bread of life, the spiritual food and nourishment of the soul.

But what will you say to our Saviour's calling the sacrament the fruit of the vine?[5]

If it were certain our Saviour had so called the consecrated wine of the blessed sacrament, it would prove no more than St. Paul's calling the consecrated host, bread;[6] that is, it would only show that the name of wine, or the fruit of the vine, might be given to it, from having the accidents and appearance of wine, and having been consecrated from wine. But there is all the reason in the world to think that this appellation of "the fruit of the vine" was given by our Saviour, not to the consecrated cup or chalice, but to the wine of the paschal supper, which they drank before the institution of the sacrament: this will appear evident, from the twenty-second chapter of St. Luke, to any one who will but read from the fourteenth verse to the twenty-first, where it is plain that it was not the sacramental cup, but that which was drunk with the passover, to which our Saviour gives the name of "the fruit of the vine."

[1] See the Bishop of Meaux's History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches.
[2] Joshua v. 13; Genesis xix; Luke xxiv. 4; Acts i. 10.
[3] Genesis iii. 19.
[4] Exodus vii. 10.
[5] Matt. xxvi. 29.
[6] 1 Cor. x. 11.

The ancient fathers often called this sacrament a figure and sign, which seems not to import grace present.

It cannot be a sacrament without being a figure or sign; but the fathers in no place call it a symbol or figure only, so as to deny or exclude the verity and substance of Christ's body and blood from being contained under them. The Eucharist is called the sign or figure of Christ's body, upon account of the species, which represent it not as absent, but really present. Hence, Tertullian says, Christ did not doubt to say, " This is my body," when he gave the figure of his body; so divines say it is a full figure, not an empty one.

Which are the articles of faith that follow from the real presence, and are defined by the Church?

First, against the Lutherans, that the reality subsists without the use, and not only while it is taken. Again, that every particle contains the true body and blood in the consecration of both species. Again, that the soul and divinity of Christ are also present. Again, that the body and blood are present, by force of the words of consecration, and both present under each species, by concomitance. Again, that Christ, in the sacrament, is to be adored with divine worship. That when the species are divided or broken, the whole body of Christ is in every particle, but undivided in itself. That when the species are corrupted, the body of Christ is not corrupted, but ceases to be present. Lastly, that the body of Christ is not everywhere, as the Ubiquitarians affirm, but only in heaven locally, and in the Eucharist sacramentally.

What is the principal effect of the Eucharist?

To bestow nutritive grace, and more plentifully than any other sacrament: though it does not confer first grace, but supposes it already given by penance. Hence, remission of sin is not the proper effect. The Eucharist, as a sacrament, only profits those who receive it. But as it is a sacrifice, it profits others. Venial sins hinder not the nutritive grace: yet they slacken the growth of virtue like a bad soil.

Who are rightly disposed to receive the Eucharist?

Divines distinguish two sorts of persons. First, those who receive the effect only by faith and ardent charity, not having an opportunity to receive the sacrament itself; yet these do not receive the proper sacramental grace. Secondly, such as receive both the sacrament and the effect. The first communion is called spiritual only, the second sacramental and spiritual. Hence it is defined by the Council of Trent that faith alone is not a sufficient preparation; but there must be a true contrition, and not a supposed one, but acquired by confession if there be an opportunity of having a confessor: all which are required by St. Paul when he says, "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup; for he who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himself, not discerning the body of our Lord."[1] The Church so expounds the preparation that is required. Again, this precept of confessing extends even to priests, who are obliged by office to celebrate, unless a confessor is wanting; and then the Council of Trent says they are to make an act of contrition, and afterward *quam primum confiteri*, which words, as Pope Alexander VII declares, import the first opportunity, and not the stated time of the priest's usual confession. In fine, in order to receive the blessed sacrament worthily, and the effects thereof, we must be in the state of grace—that is, free from all mortal sin and affection to venial. We must also approach with a right intention: first, to glorify God, and give him thanks for so great a favor and blessing, in bestowing upon us his only Son; secondly, to strengthen our souls in spiritual life, and to gain an increase of charity and all other virtues; and thirdly, to obtain the grace and assistance of Almighty God, in order to correct all our failings and imperfections, and to overcome such and such temptations.

What fasting is required before receiving Holy Communion?

There is an ecclesiastical precept (which, St. Augustine says, was all over the Church in his time) that no communicant should

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 28.

THE DISCIPLES AT EMMAUS

FROM THE FAMOUS PAINTING BY REMBRANDT

"And it came to pass, whilst he was at table with them, he took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened; and they knew him: and he vanished out of their sight."

either eat or drink from the midnight before. Yet St. Augustine observes that on Maundy Thursday it was a custom to receive not fasting, in honor and memory of Christ's Last Supper. However, when the Blessed Sacrament is given, by way of Viaticum, in danger of death, fasting is not necessary.

Is there an obligation of receiving under both kinds?

There is no divine precept. There is, indeed, a divine precept of taking the body and blood, which is complied with under one kind alone; because, as I said before, under either kind are contained both the body and blood of Christ.

It is owned, both kinds were given to the apostles at the institution, but every circumstance at the institution was not a divine precept. As to the words, "unless you eat and drink" (John vi. 54), they are not to be understood of the distinct actions, but only of partaking of the body and blood: for in the same chapter life everlasting is promised to those who eat only: "he that eats of this bread shall live for ever" (verse 59). Again, "If any one eateth me, the same shall also live by me" (verse 58). You see, eating alone will suffice. Again, the Scripture, in many places, speaking of the Holy Communion, makes no mention of the cup (see St. Luke xxiv. 30, 31; Acts ii. 42, 46; xx. 7). Besides, it is to be observed that whosoever receives the body of Christ, must certainly receive his blood at the same time, since the body which he receives is a living body (for Christ can die no more, says St. Paul[1]), which cannot be without his blood: there is no taking Christ by pieces; whoever receives him, receives him wholly. So that the faithful are no ways deprived of any part of the grace of this sacrament by receiving in one kind only: and the reason is, because the grace of this sacrament being annexed to the real presence of Christ, who is the fountain of all grace, and Christ being as truly and really present in one kind as in both, consequently he brings with him the same grace to the soul when received in one kind as he does when received in both. Again, many learned Protestants have acknowledged that there is no command in Scripture for all to

[1] Rom. vi. 9.

receive in both kinds.[1] But abstracting from what has been said, our adversaries have no reason to object against us for defrauding the laity of part of the grace of the sacrament, since they deprive them of the whole—namely, both body and blood—as receiving neither one nor the other, but only a little bread and wine. As for the practice of the primitive ages, both kinds were commonly taken, but not always: for the ancient fathers give an account that in time of persecution Christians took only the consecrated bread, which they carried home with them. Also, abstemious persons, who had an aversion to wine, received only the consecrated bread. Again, infants received only the consecrated wine. Pope Gelasius, indeed, ordered both kinds to be given, in order to detect the Manicheans, who abstained from wine because they held it to be a liquor of the devil's invention, and communicated only in the other kind, upon that belief. This was the ground of Pope Gelasius's prohibition; but afterward, in Pope Leo II's time, it was free to communicate in one or both kinds.

When did the custom of communicating in both kinds cease, and what reasons were there to order only one kind?

It ceased by degrees. And the reasons were these: first, there was danger of great irreverences by spilling the consecrated wine when the communicants were very numerous. Secondly, lest the wine being reserved for the sick, it should grow sour and be corrupted. Thirdly, to confound those heretics who believed Christ's body was without his blood. And lastly, this discipline of the Church was confirmed by the General Council of Constance, in the year 1414, to put a stop to the Hussites and other heretics, who held that both kinds were of divine precept.

Can the Church still order or permit both kinds to be received?

Yes, if she shall judge the reasons to be sufficient.

But did not Christ expressly command the receiving in both kinds when he said, "Drink ye all of this"?[2]

[1] See Luther, Epistle to the Bohemians; Bishop Forbes, De Euch., lib. 2, cap. i. 2; White, Bishop of Ely, Treatise on the Sabbath, p. 97; Bishop Montague, Orig., p. 97.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 27.

These words were addressed to the twelve apostles only, no other being present at the Last Supper, and the precept was by them all fulfilled: "and they all drank of it."[1] And this command is constantly observed by the bishops and priests of the Catholic Church, as often as they consecrate. But this is no more an argument for the laity's being obliged to drink the cup, than their being obliged to consecrate, to forgive sins, or to preach the Gospel,[2] because we find, in the Scripture, Christ commanded the apostles so to do.

Are priests obliged to receive in both kinds?

Yes, when they consecrate; and the reason is, because the Eucharist is a sacrifice as well as a sacrament. Now, unless both kinds are consecrated and offered by the priest, and received, it does not represent Christ's Passion.

May not deacons consecrate?

By no means: *do this*, was directed to bishops and priests only. However, deacons may be the extraordinary distributers of the sacrament, as it was sometime a practice in the primitive ages.

What is a sacrifice, and how does that appellation agree with the Eucharist?

A sacrifice, properly so called, is an external oblation or offering made to God alone, by a lawful minister, with a change in the thing offered by consecration, in testimony of his supreme power. Now this agrees with the Eucharist, because the Eucharist is an oblation of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, offered under the outward and sensible signs of bread and wine, to God alone, by the ministry of the priests of the Church, lawfully consecrated and empowered by Christ; and this oblation is accompanied with a real change and destruction of the bread and wine, by the consecration of them into the body and blood of Christ, and a real exhibiting of Christ our Victim, heretofore immolated upon the cross, and here mystically dying, in the separate consecration of the two different species; and this oblation is made to God, to

[1] Mark xiv. 23. [2] Luke xxii. 19; John xx. 22; Matt. xxviii. 19.

acknowledge his sovereign power, to render him our homage, and for all other ends for which sacrifices are offered to his divine majesty.

What are the ends for which sacrifice in the old law was offered, and is still to be offered, to God?

For these four ends. First, for God's own honor and glory, by acknowledging his sovereignty, and paying him our homage. Secondly, to give God thanks for all his blessings. Thirdly, to beg pardon for our sins. Fourthly, to obtain grace and all blessings from his divine majesty.

Have the servants of God, from the beginning of the world, been always accustomed to honor him with sacrifices?

Yes, they have. Witness the sacrifice of Abel,[1] the sacrifice of Noah,[2] the sacrifice of Melchisedech,[3] the sacrifices of Abraham,[4] the sacrifices of Job,[5] and the many different kinds of sacrifices prescribed in the law of Moses.

How is a sacrifice, properly so called, distinguished from other oblations, namely, prayer, good works, and a contrite heart?

These want requisites, that is, they are either spiritual oblations only, or are not offered only by a priest; nor is there any change to testify God's supreme dominion.

How many kinds of sacrifice belonged to the old law?

Chiefly five: first, holocaust, where the whole was consumed or burned, and thereby given fully to God without reserve, for the more perfect acknowledgment of his sovereignty; secondly, propitiatory, or sin-offerings, for appeasing God's anger and remitting sin; thirdly, eucharistic, for returning thanks; fourthly, impetratory, for obtaining blessings; and fifthly, pacific, or peace-offerings, which were both eucharistic and propitiatory.

Why are all those sacrifices now abolished?

Because they were but figures of the sacrifice of Christ; and, therefore, were to give place to his sacrifice, as being only figures of the truth.

[1] Genesis iv. [2] *Ibid.* viii. [3] *Ibid.* xiv.
[4] *Ibid.* xv, xxii. [5] Job i.

Were the sacrifices of the old law figures of the sacrifice of the new?

Yes, both of Christ's Passion and of the Eucharist.

What is the Mass, and whence is the word derived?

The Mass, in one sense, may be called the liturgy of the Catholic Church; but, properly speaking, it is the sacrifice or oblation of Christ's body and blood under the appearance or species of bread and wine, and consists in the consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and the offering up of this same body and blood to God, by the ministry of the priest, for a perpetual memorial of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross. As to the word Mass, some are of opinion that it comes from the Hebrew word *missach*, which signifies a voluntary offering.[1] But others are of opinion that it is derived from the Latin word *missio*, or *missa*, that is, dismission, or sending away; because the catechumens and others were formerly dismissed, as not being permitted to be present at this sacrifice, only from the beginning till the offertory; and the Gospel and sermon being ended, the deacon publicly said, *Ite missa est* ("Go out, all you who are infidels, catechumens, and penitents: for the Mass of the faithful is now to begin"). Hence, at the end of the Mass, the words *Ite missa est* are still retained, and now the meaning is, "Depart, for the Mass is ended." But be this as it will, the name is of very ancient use in the Church, as appears from St. Ambrose, St. Leo, and St. Gregory.

How does the sacrifice of the Mass differ from the sacrifice Christ made upon the cross?

There is no difference as to the Host, or thing offered, nor as to the principal Priest who offers; the chief offerer being Christ himself. The difference, therefore, is only in the manner of the offering—the one was bloody, the other unbloody; for in the sacrifice of the cross Christ really died, and therefore it was a bloody sacrifice; in the sacrifice of the Mass, he only dies mystically, inasmuch as his death is represented in the consecrating apart the bread and wine, to denote the shedding of his sacred blood from his body

[1] Deut. xvi. 10.

at the time of his death, and therefore this is an unbloody sacrifice, and of course a commemorating sacrifice, which has all its virtue from the sacrifice of the cross.

Is the sacrifice of the Mass offered to saints?

No; only to God. The saints are only mentioned to give praise and thanksgiving to God for them, and that they may join in prayer with us, and for us.

Is the Mass a true and proper sacrifice?

Yes, it is.

How can it be a true and proper sacrifice, since a true sacrifice requires a change, or mactation, or immolation, in the thing offered? Now in the Mass these things are not to be found.

In bloody sacrifices a mactation, or slaying, was necessary, but not in others; Melchisedech's was a true and proper sacrifice, and so were the pacific sacrifices of the old law; however, in the sacrifice of the Mass there is a real change, by the real conversion of the bread into his body, as also a mystical immolation or death, when the body and blood are, as it were, separated by distinct consecrations.

Have you any texts of Scripture for proof of the sacrifice of the Mass?

Yes; besides many figures of this sacrifice in the Old Testament (of which the most evident is that of the bread and wine offered by Melchisedech, the priest of the most high God; according to whose order Christ is said to be a priest forever,[1] and that, as the holy fathers take notice, by reason of this new sacrifice of the Eucharist), we have the prophecy of Malachi i. 10, 11, where God, rejecting the Jewish sacrifices, declares his acceptance of the sacrifice or pure offering which should be made to him in every place among the Gentiles; which text the ancient fathers, both Greek and Latin, urge to show that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. (See St. Justin, St. Irenæus, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and others.) In the New Testament, St. Paul tells us that under the new law we have an altar (and consequently a sacrifice) whereof

[1] Genesis xiv. 18; Psalm cx.

they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle,[1] that is, they who continue in the service of the old law. And in the tenth chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, from the fourteenth verse to the twenty-first, he makes a parallel between the partakers of the Christian sacrifice and those who partake of the Jewish or heathenish victims, so as evidently to suppose that the Christian table, which he mentions (verse 21), is an altar where Christ is mystically immolated and afterward eaten by the faithful, as in the Jewish and heathenish sacrifices the victim was first offered on the altar and then eaten by the people. Whence the apostle St. Paul infers (verse 16) that they who were partakers of this great sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ ought not to be partakers with devils, by eating the meats sacrificed to idols. The sacrifice of the Mass is also mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (xiii. 2), where we read in the Protestant Testament, "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted," etc. In the Greek original it stands thus, "As they were sacrificing [*Leitourgountan*] to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them," where the Greek word, which we have rendered in English "sacrificing," is the self-same which to this day is used by the Greeks to express the sacrifice of the Mass. Besides these arguments from Scripture for the sacrifice offered to God in the blessed Eucharist, we have the authority and perpetual tradition of the Catholic Church, from the days of the apostles. Witness the most ancient liturgies of all churches and nations. Witness the manifold testimonies of councils and fathers of all ages. Witness the frequent use, in all Christian antiquity, of the names of altar, sacrifice, oblation, priest, etc. Witness, in fine, the universal consent of Christians of all denominations before Luther's time, in offering up the Eucharist as a sacrifice, which is a matter of fact that cannot be contested.

But does not St. Paul say that Christ, by one offering—namely, that of the cross—hath perfected forever them that are

[1] Heb. xiii. 10.

sanctified?[1] What room, then, can there be for the sacrifice of the Mass?

What the apostle says is certainly true, that the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross is that one offering by which we are perfected forever; because the whole world was redeemed by that one sacrifice, and all other means of our sanctification or salvation have their force and efficacy from that one offering: yet as that one offering, by which Christ hath perfected forever them that are sanctified, is no way injured by his supplications which as man he makes for us to his Father in heaven—where, as the same apostle tells us, he ever liveth to make intercession for us[2]—so neither is it any ways injured, but highly honored by the representing of the same offering to God in the sacrifice of the altar.

But St. Paul tells us that Christ does not offer himself often.[3] What say you to this?

St. Paul speaks there of his offering himself in a bloody manner by dying for the redemption of the world, which was to be but once. But though the price of our redemption was to be paid but once, yet the fruit of it was to be daily applied to our souls, by those means of grace which Christ has left in his Church; that is, by the sacraments and sacrifice.

Have you anything more to allege for proof of the sacrifice of the Mass?

Yes; we have the words of the institution, as they are related by St. Luke (xxii. 19, 20): "This is my body which is given for you. . . . This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you." Now, since we really believe that by the words of consecration, the bread and wine are truly changed into the body and blood of Christ—and, consequently, that our Victim, which for us was immolated upon the cross, is in the Mass exhibited and presented to God—the Mass, therefore, is properly an offering or sacrifice; and it is also a propitiatory sacrifice: for if the chalice —namely, the blood of Christ—be shed for us (that is, for our sins),

[1] Heb. x. 14. [2] *Ibid.* vii. 25. [3] *Ibid.* ix. 25.

it must needs be propitiatory, at least by applying to us the fruit of the bloody sacrifice of the cross.

But what need was there of the sacrifice of the Mass, since we were fully redeemed by the sacrifice of the cross?

First, that we might have, in the sacrifice of the Mass, a standing memorial of the death of Christ. Secondly, that by the sacrifice of the Mass the fruit of his death might daily be applied to our souls. Thirdly, that his children might have, until the end of the world, an external sacrifice, in which they might join together in the outward worship of religion, as the servants of God had always done from the beginning of the world. Fourthly, that in and by this sacrifice they might unite themselves daily with their High Priest and Victim, Christ Jesus, and daily answer the four ends of sacrifice.

What effects has the Eucharist as a sacrifice?

The Council of Trent has defined that it is more than a sacrifice of praise, or a mere commemoration of Christ's Passion, and that it is *latreuticum*, that is to say, by it we give to God divine honor; *eucharisticum*, that is, by it we give thanks to God for his benefits and mercies bestowed upon us; *propitiatorium*, that is, by it we obtain pardon and remission of our sins; *impetratorium*, that is, by it we obtain new graces and blessings.

Does it remit sin, or the pain due to sin by way of satisfaction?

It is propitiatory and satisfactory, by virtue of the divine institution, as to pain, both in this world and purgatory, when it is applied with due dispositions, and according to the intention of the Church, it being the best of satisfactory or good works.

Is the Mass of a wicked priest as valuable as that of a just one?

It has the same effect absolutely, because a wicked man offers in the person of Christ and the Church; yet the private devotion of the good priest may add to the efficacy in other respects.

For whom is Mass offered?

For all the faithful, both living and dead, as also for all infidels, heretics, etc., that they may be converted; yet their particular names are not to be mentioned in the Mass.

What advantage is the sacrifice of the Mass to the living and the dead?

It procures to the living the merits and the fruit of the sacrifice of the cross—that is, the grace we stand in need of, especially to those for whom it is said, and those who assist devoutly at it. As to the dead, it lessens their pains in purgatory, and hastens their deliverance out of it.

What mean all the ceremonies of the Mass, and how can additions be made to the ceremonies instituted by Christ?

They have a spiritual meaning and are instructive; some were instituted by Christ himself, others added by the apostles, others since by the Church, but these are not essentials, yet they cannot be omitted without a great sin.

How ought persons to hear Mass, and with what affection?

With great respect, devotion, and attention,[1] and with that affection for which sacrifices were instituted, that is, with a devout acknowledgment of our duty to God; with an earnest desire to appease the wrath of God, which we have deserved for our sins; and also with thanksgiving to our blessed Saviour, that he has vouchsafed to leave to his Church his own precious body and blood, as a pledge of his love, to be offered up to his eternal Father by us, in testimony of the aforesaid acknowledgment, and as a means to appease his deserved anger.

But what think you of those who, during the time of Mass, instead of attending to this great sacrifice, suffer themselves to be carried away with wilful distractions?

Such as these do not hear Mass, that is, they do not fulfil the Church precept, nor satisfy the obligation of the day, but rather mock God, while outwardly they pretend to honor him, when their heart is far from him. The like is to be said of those who in time of Mass are laughing or talking, or who pass the greater part of the time in criminal amusements. This sort of persons must also answer for the scandal they give by their ill example, and for their hindering others from attending to their duty; as well as for their

[1] Jer. xviii. 10.

profaning these most sacred mysteries by such an unchristian behavior at this holy time.

Is it not a prejudice to the faithful that Mass is said in an unknown tongue?

No; for the Mass contains only those prayers which the priest alone is commanded to say as the mediator between God and his people. Neither are the people ignorant of what is said, since they have the Mass expounded and Englished in their ordinary prayer-book; and it is visible to any unprejudiced eye that there is far more devotion among Catholics at Mass than there is at the Protestants' common prayer.

Can you explain to me, by some example, how a person may devoutly and profitably assist at this sacrifice, though he be ignorant of the prayers which the priest is saying?

Yes, we can; for what do you think, if you, or any good Christian, had been present upon Mount Calvary, when Christ was offering himself upon the cross, a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world; would not the very sight of what was doing (provided that you had the same faith in Christ as you now have) have sufficed to excite in your soul most lively acts of the love of God, thanksgiving for so great a mercy, detestation for your sins, etc., though you could neither hear any word from the mouth of Christ your High Priest, nor know in particular what passed in his soul? Just so in the Mass, which is the same sacrifice as that which Christ offered upon the cross, because both the Priest and the Victim are the same. It is abundantly sufficient for the people's devotion to be well instructed in what is then doing, and to excite in their souls suitable acts of adoration, praise, thanksgiving, repentance, etc., though they understand not the particular prayers used by the priest at that time. Besides, it is not necessary, for the devout and profitable concurring in sacrifice offered to God, that the people should hear or recite the same prayers with the priest; nay, even the very seeing of him is more than what God was pleased to require in the old law. Hence we find that the whole multitude of the people were praying without when Zachary went into the temple to burn

incense.[1] And it was expressly ordered that there should be no man in the tabernacle or temple when the high priest went with the blood of the victims into the sanctuary to make atonement.[2]

But does not St. Paul condemn the use of unknown tongues in the liturgy of the Church (1 Corinthians xiv)?

Whoever will but read that whole chapter with attention will easily see that St. Paul speaks not a word of the liturgy of the Church, but only reprehends the abuse of the gift of tongues, which some among the Corinthians were guilty of, who out of ostentation affected to make exhortations or extempore prayers in their assemblies, in languages utterly unknown, which, for want of an interpreter, could be of no edification to the rest of the faithful. But this is far from being the practice of the Catholic Church, where all exhortations, sermons, and such like instructions, are made in the vulgar language; where there is no want of interpreters, since the people have the Church offices interpreted in their ordinary prayer-books, and the pastors are commanded to explain often to them, particularly upon Sundays and holydays, the mysteries contained in the Mass. Besides, after all, though the Latin be a dead language, yet, in the sense of St. Paul, it cannot be called an unknown tongue, since there is no language in Europe more universally understood, there being scarce a village without somebody who understands it.

But why does the Church celebrate the Mass in Latin, rather than in the vulgar language?

First, because it is her ancient language, used in all her sacred offices, even from the apostles' days, throughout all the western parts of the world; and therefore the Church, who hates novelty, desires to celebrate her liturgy in the same language as the saints have done for so many ages. Secondly, for a greater uniformity in the public worship; so that a Catholic, in whatsoever country he chances to be, may still find the liturgy performed in the same manner, and in the same language, to which he is accustomed at home. Thirdly, to avoid the changes to which all vulgar languages,

[1] Luke i. 10. [2] Levit. xvi. 17.

INCREDULITY OF ST. THOMAS

FROM THE PAINTING BY RUBENS

"Put in thy finger hither, and see my hands; and bring hither thy hand, and put it into my side: and be not incredulous, but faithful."

as we find by experience, are daily exposed. Nor is this method peculiar to the Catholic Church alone: for all the Oriental schismatics, how different soever, use in their liturgies their ancient languages, which have long since ceased to be understood by the people; as we learn from M. Renaudot, in his "Dissertation upon the Oriental Liturgies," chapter vi. The Greeks say Mass in the old Greek, of which the common people (as Mr. Brerewood, in his "Inquiries," ii. 12, says) understand little or nothing. The Ethiopians and Armenians say Mass in the old Ethiopian and Armenian tongue, which none but the learned understand. The Syrians, Indians, and Egyptians say Mass in Syriac, though Arabic is their vulgar language. The Muscovites say Mass in Greek, though it is not the language of the people, who speak nothing but a kind of Sclavonian. So that those who declaim so violently against the Roman Catholic Church for not having the public service in the vulgar tongues, have the universal practice of Christendom against them. And what is very remarkable is that the Protestants have furnished us with an excellent argument against themselves for having the divine service celebrated in such a language as the people do not understand: for we read, in Dr. Heylin's "History of the Reformation" (pages 128, etc.), that in Queen Elizabeth's time "the Irish Parliament passed an act for the uniformity of common prayer; with permission of saying the same in Latin, where the minister had not the knowledge of the English tongue. But for translating it into Irish there was no care taken. The people are required by that statute, under severe penalties, to frequent their churches, and to be present at the reading of the English liturgy, which they understand no more of than they do of the Mass."

PENANCE

WHAT is the signification of the word *penance*?

It is much the same with *repentance*; and, according to the Latin and Greek, is used to signify a change of the mind.

What is the ecclesiastical use of the word?

It is sometimes taken for a certain virtue belonging to justice, and is a sincere grief for having offended God, with a firm purpose to offend him no more. Again, it is taken for a sacrament, which is a sorrow for sins committed after baptism, including confession and a purpose of making satisfaction. So that it is a sacrament whereby the sins we commit after baptism are forgiven us.

When was this sacrament first instituted?

There was an intimation and promise of it when our Saviour said, "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed in heaven";[1] which promise was actually performed, after our Saviour's resurrection, when "he breathed upon his apostles, and said to them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained."[2]

How do you prove from this that penance is a sacrament?

From the notion and definition of a sacrament, namely, an outward and visible sign of inward grace, ordained by Jesus Christ. The outward or visible sign is the sinner's confession and the form of absolution pronounced by the priest; the inward grace is the remission of sins promised by Jesus Christ. (See St. John xx. 22, 23.) The institution of Christ is gathered from the same place, and from St. Matthew xviii. 18.

What are the matter and form of the sacrament?

The matter is twofold, namely, remote and immediate. The remote matter is sin, mortal and venial; the immediate are the acts of the penitent, namely, contrition, confession, and satisfaction. The form is the words of absolution.

To what end is this sacrament instituted?

For the remission of sins committed after baptism.

Is this sacrament necessary for salvation?

Yes, it is as necessary as baptism, in regard of those who fall into mortal sin after they are baptized.

Are not the words importing a power of forgiving and retain-

[1] Matt. xviii. 18. [2] John xx. 22, 23.

ing sin sufficiently verified by the power given to the apostles to preach the Gospel?

This, indeed, the Calvinists pretend, but falsely, there being two distinct ceremonies instituted for that purpose, namely, baptism and penance, as the fathers expressly affirm, besides preaching. (See St. Ambrose, in his Book of Penance.)

What differences are observable between baptism and penance?

In baptism sin is forgiven, by a true contrition, as a necessary preparation in the adult. It requires not confession; it remits the whole pain due to sin; it absolves not juridically; it gives a character, and cannot be repeated. It is absolutely necessary to infants; and to adults, at least in desire, if otherwise not obtainable. As for penance, jurisdiction is necessary; it requires certain dispositions, namely, a sorrow and purpose to sin no more; it may be repeated; it requires confession, but it does not remit all the pain due to sin; lastly, it requires satisfaction.

What is it to forgive sin?

It is to pronounce the words of absolution ministerially, under Christ, the principal Cause. So that we do not believe that man can forgive sins by his own power, as no man, by his own power, can raise the dead to life: because both the one and the other equally belong to the power of God. But as God has sometimes made man his instrument in raising the dead to life, so we believe that he has been pleased to appoint that his ministers should, in virtue of his commission, as his instruments, and by his power, absolve repenting sinners. And this is what the Protestants pretend to believe, as well as we; for we find in their common prayer-book, in the order for the visitation of the sick, where they prescribe a form of absolution, the same in substance as that used in the Catholic Church; which is as follows: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent, and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: and, by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

What is it to retain sins?

It is to refuse or defer absolution for sin.

Pray tell me in what cases is a confessor to refuse or defer absolution?

The rule of the Church is to defer absolution (excepting the case of necessity) to those of whose disposition the confessor has just cause to doubt; and to refuse or deny absolution to those who are certainly indisposed for it; which is the case of all such as refuse to forgive their enemies, or to restore ill-gotten goods, or to forsake the habits or immediate occasions of sin; or, in a word, to comply with any part of their duty, to which they are obliged under mortal sin.

What is contrition, and why so called?

It is an inward sorrow of the mind for having offended so good a God, with a firm purpose not to offend him any more. It is so called because the word contrition signifies a bruising, or breaking a thing into pieces, which is metaphorically applied to the heart, which is as it were bruised and broken by grief.

How many sorts of contrition are there?

Two: perfect and imperfect.

What is perfect contrition?

It is a hearty sorrow for having offended God, including a love of God above all things, as he is good in himself.

What is imperfect contrition?

It is a sorrow for having offended God, through fear of the pains of hell, the turpitude of sin, or some other imperfect, but supernatural motive.

By what name do you call imperfect contrition, and how does it differ from perfect contrition?

It is called *attrition*. Now, as to the difference, they differ in their motive. The motive of perfect contrition is God, as he is good in himself. The motive of attrition is fear of punishment, etc. Yet here also the motive must be supernatural, and the sorrow must proceed from actual grace. Again, they differ in their effects. The first is capable to justify a person, without the sacrament of

penance, who has a desire, but not the opportunity of a confessor. The second only disposes a person for justification in the sacrament.

When are we obliged to make an act of contrition?

Chiefly upon the following occasions, namely, in danger of death; again, as often as we receive any of the sacraments, if we have not the convenience of confessing.

Are we obliged to make so many distinct acts of contrition, according to the number of our sins?

No; one true act of contrition extends to all: yet a diligent examination of conscience is to be premised before we make our confession.

What is confession, and how many sorts are there?

Confession, in general, is a declaration of a person's sins, which may be either general or particular, public or private, to God, or to man, by way of advice, or sacramental.

What is sacramental confession?

It is an accusation of our sins to a proper priest; that is to say, to a priest who is approved of by the bishop, etc., in order to receive absolution.

Can you bring any Scripture which recommends the confession of our sins to the ministers of God, and can you prove it to be commanded by Christ?

In the first place, I can produce the precept of God in the Old Testament, where he expressly commands that when a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that person be guilty, then he shall confess his sins which he has done, etc.[1] Secondly, the example of the people who hearkened to the preaching of St. John the Baptist, who were baptized by him, confessing their sins.[2] Thirdly, the command of St. James, "Confess your sins one to another" (chapter v, verse 16), that is, to the priests of the Church. Fourthly, the practice of the first Christians: "many that believed came, and confessed, and declared their deeds."[3] Now, as to the command of Christ for the confession of our sins to his ministers,

[1] Num. v. 6, 7. [2] Matt. iii. 6. [3] Acts xix. 18.

I prove it from the commission which he gave to them when he said to his apostles, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained."[1] Here he gave them and their successors—namely, the bishops and priests of his Church—commission or power to remit sin. Again, the apostles and their successors were made spiritual judges by Christ our Lord, and had a power from him to bind and loose from sin, as we read in the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew, verse 18: "Amen, I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." Here he made them judges and physicians of our souls; therefore it follows, by a necessary consequence, that the laity were obliged to confess their sins to them: for how could they exercise this power, and pronounce sentence, unless they first knew the state of the sinner's conscience; neither could they prescribe such remedies and give such advice as was necessary for the penitent's cure or amendment, unless they first knew the particular qualities and condition of the several sins the penitent committed, which could not be without confession; so that we conclude with St. Augustine, that to pretend that it is enough to confess to God alone is making void the power of the keys given to the Church, that is, contradicting the Gospel, and nullifying the commission of Christ.

Are Christians obliged to confess all their sins?

Yes; all mortal sins that can be remembered after a diligent examen. Moreover, the penitent is to declare their number, species, and circumstances; not only such circumstances as alter the kind or nature of the sin, but also, according to some divines, such as very much aggravate the guilt. Now, as to venial sins, there is no strict obligation to confess them; but if it be doubtful whether the sin be mortal or venial, he is to confess it under that doubt.

By what rule shall a person be able to know whether his sins are mortal or venial?

All those sins are to be esteemed mortal which the Word of

[1] John xx. 22, 23.

God represents to us as hateful to God, against which it pronounces a "wo," or of which it declares that such as do those things shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Of these we have many instances, both in the Old and the New Testament. (See Isaiah v; Ezekiel xviii; Romans i. 29, 30, 31; 1 Corinthians vi. 9, 10; Galatians v. 19, 20, 21; Ephesians v. 5; Apocalypse xxi. 8.)

In what cases is confession sacrilegious and void?

If any mortal sin is wilfully omitted, or a diligent examen neglected, either as to number or species of the sins, or for want of a true sorrow for sin, or a firm purpose of amendment. The confession is also invalid if the priest to whom it is made has not the necessary faculties and approbation. But in case the penitent omits any sin, after a diligent examen, the confession is valid; however, if afterward he calls to mind any sin he omitted, he is to confess it; if he remembers it before communion, it ought to be confessed before he goes to communion; if he remembers it after communion, he must confess it in his next confession.

Is it a great sin to conceal, through shame or fear, any mortal sin in confession?

Yes; it is a grievous sin, because it is lying to the Holy Ghost, for which Ananias and Sapphira were struck dead by a just judgment of God.[1] It is acting deceitfully with God, and that in a matter of the utmost consequence. It is a sacrilege, as being an abuse of the sacrament of penance, and is generally followed by another great sacrilege, in receiving unworthily the body and blood of Christ. And what is still more dreadful, such sinners seldom stop at the first bad confession and communion, but usually go on for a long time in these sins, and very often die in them. It is not only a great crime, but also a great folly and madness, to conceal one's sins in confession, because such offenders know very well that these sins must be confessed, or that they must burn forever in the flames of hell for them; and they cannot be ignorant that these bad confessions do but increase their burden, by adding to it the dreadful guilt of repeated sacrileges, which they will have far more

[1] Acts v; James ii. 10. See also picture, Volume I, page 12.

difficulty of confessing than these very sins of which they are now so much ashamed.

But suppose the sinner has been so unfortunate as to make a bad confession, or perhaps a great many bad confessions; what must he do to repair this fault, and to reinstate himself in God's grace?

He must apply himself to God, by hearty prayer for his grace and mercy; and so prepare himself to make a general confession of all his sins, at least from the time he first made a bad confession; because all the confessions he has made since he began to conceal his sins were all sacrilegious, and consequently null and void, and therefore must be all repeated.

What observation do you make concerning the secrecy of confession, both in regard of the penitent and the confessor?

In the first place, there is no obligation of a public confession of private sins. Again, we are not to discover other persons' sins, but only our own. As to the confessor, he is obliged to perpetual secrecy, both by the law of nature, the law of God, and his Church; so that whatever is declared in confession, the confessor can never discover it, either directly or indirectly, to any one, upon any account whatsoever; nay, not even to save his own life. The violation of this secrecy is punished with deposition and perpetual penance.

Tell me now, in short, how many, and what, are the conditions necessary for the worthy receiving the sacrament of penance?

There are five: First, to examine our conscience; secondly, to conceive a hatred and detestation against sin, and a sorrow for having fallen into it and incurred the displeasure and wrath of God; thirdly, to make a firm resolution of sinning no more; fourthly, to make a good confession of all our sins to a priest who is approved by the Church; fifthly, a resolution of making satisfaction to God and our neighbor, according to our ability.

Who is the proper minister of penance, and qualified to hear confessions?

Only those who are lawfully ordained to offer up the sacrifice

of the Mass, and have priest's orders, and are approved by the bishop of the diocese in which they wish to hear confessions.

Has every priest power to absolve from sin?

In answer to this, we are to observe that there are two powers a priest is endowed with. One is a power of binding and loosing the soul, called the power of orders; the other is a power of exercising the power of binding and loosing, and is called the power of jurisdiction. The first power is given when a priest is ordained and made capable of absolving; the other a priest does not receive until subjects are allotted him, on whom he is to exercise that power, which is conferred upon him by the Pope, bishop, or other prelate who has jurisdiction. So that every priest has not the power of jurisdiction, and, by consequence, every priest cannot absolve from sin. How much, therefore, does it behoove all penitents to be very careful to make use of a priest who has the power of jurisdiction; that is, of one who is rightly approved; because, if they confess to one who is not approved of by the bishop of the place, their confession is null, and the priest's absolution is of no force or value.

What is the form of absolution?

"Our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee, and I, by his authority, absolve thee, as far as I have power, and thou standest in need, from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

What is satisfaction?

It is doing what is sufficient, or what is required from a person, for the injury he does to another.

What is sacramental satisfaction?

It is undergoing the penalty imposed by the priest, toward repairing the injury done to God's honor, and redeeming the temporal pain due to sin.

Which are the penalties whereby we may satisfy for sin?

In the first place, all calamities human life is subject to, when they are willingly embraced for that purpose. Again, fasting, prayer, and alms, with all other pious works.

In what manner do we repair God's honor by the aforesaid pains, and why?

They are all recommended and commanded, in the Scriptures, by Almighty God. We are to submit with patience to all temporal calamities, in compliance with Divine Providence. By prayer, we submit our soul and regulate all its faculties to the divine will. By fasting, we punish the body for committing excesses. By alms, we satisfy for the ill use we make of the goods of fortune. For as all sins are committed against God, our neighbor, and ourselves; so all duties to God are contained under prayer, both internal and external: duties toward our neighbor, as acts of fraternal love, etc., are contained under alms; duties toward ourselves, as mortification and the like, are contained under fasting.

Whence have priests the power of imposing penalties or satisfactory works?

From Christ, who gave them power of binding and loosing, both from sins and the penalties due to sin; as in temporal tribunals the power that frees from death extends to assign pardon or punishment proper to reform the offender.

Which are the chief properties of the penalty imposed?

They satisfy for the temporal pain, and ought to be medicinal, that is, proper to reform the sinner.

Is satisfaction an essential part of the sacrament of penance?

An intention of satisfaction is essential, but actual satisfaction belongs only to the integrity of the sacrament; for the absolution is valid before the satisfaction is performed; though in some cases it is requisite that satisfaction precede absolution.

This doctrine of satisfaction supposes a false thing, namely, that some pain is due to sin after the fault is pardoned?

Divines distinguish between eternal pain and temporal pain; the eternal pain is forgiven, but the temporal pain commonly remains, as it appears both from the necessity of the thing, the instance of David, who was punished by the death of his children after his sins were forgiven,[1] and other instances of temporal

[1] 2 Kings xii.

calamities inflicted for offences, though pardoned. And this method of temporal pain is the foundation of our faith as to sacramental satisfaction, indulgences, purgatory, and prayer for the dead.

Can one person satisfy for another?

Yes; it is defined by the Church, and appears in the prayers of persons, etc. Yet medicinal satisfaction is personal, and cannot be communicated to another.

What is an indulgence?

It is a remission of the temporal punishment due to sins, after the sins themselves, as to the guilt and the eternal punishment, are forgiven by the sacrament of penance, or perfect contrition. Hence nothing can be more grossly misrepresented than indulgences are by our adversaries; for the generality of Protestants imagine that an indulgence is a leave to commit sin, or, at least, that it is a pardon for sins to come; whereas it is no such thing. For we believe there is no power in heaven or earth that can give leave to commit sin; and consequently there is no giving pardon beforehand for sins to come.

How do you prove that the Church has received a power from Christ to grant indulgences, that is, to discharge a penitent sinner from the debt of the temporal punishment which remains due to sins?

I prove it from the promise which Christ made to St. Peter: "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."[1] Which promise, made without any exception, reservation, or limitation, must needs imply a power of loosing all such bonds as might otherwise hinder or retard a Christian soul from entering heaven.

How does an indulgence take off the obligation of personal satisfaction?

It takes off the penal but not the medicinal part.

Do indulgences for the dead remit the pains in purgatory?

[1] Matt. xvi. 19.

Not by way of absolution or jurisdiction, but only by way of prayer or suffrage accepted by God.

What dispositions are required to gain an indulgence?

The person must be in the state of grace, confess and communicate, and perform the things required while he is in the state of grace.

What is a plenary indulgence?

If duly obtained, it is a remission of all the temporal punishment due to past sins.

What is a partial indulgence?

It is a remission of part of the temporal punishment due to sin.

I suppose this is meant by an indulgence of seven, ten, twenty, thirty, or forty days or years. But I comprehend not the meaning of this calculation.

According to the ancient canons and discipline of the Church, temporal punishments of such a number of days or years were decreed for certain sins: and when there was sufficient reason to shorten the time, it was called an indulgence.

But these canons being no longer in force, I do not see what can be the present meaning of an indulgence for so many days or years. If a sinner is obliged no longer to those punishments, he is free, and stands not in need of an indulgence.

Though those canons are not in force, the law of God is still in force, which requires temporal punishment for sin; and the Church, by the power it has, relaxes as much punishment as was formerly inflicted by the ancient canons.

Has not Christ abundantly satisfied both for sin and the punishment due to it, both temporal and eternal? Can the Church dispose of the merits and satisfaction of Christ?

Christ has abundantly satisfied and laid up the treasure for that purpose, but the remedy is to be applied accordingly as he has ordered. It is applied by the sacraments and good works for the remission of sin; it is applied by indulgences for the remission of temporal punishment, as there shall be found just occasion.

What is a jubilee?

It is a solemn plenary indulgence, accompanied with certain privileges, relating to censures and dispensations, granted to the inferior pastors of the Church by the Supreme Pastor, and specified in his bulls or orders directed to them for that purpose; and it is so called from the resemblance it bears to the jubilee year in the old law (which was a year of remission, in which bondsmen were restored to liberty, and every one returned to his possession).[1] But, according to some, it is so called from the Latin word *jubilatio*, which signifies joy or exultation, because it causes a spiritual joy in the souls of all who are made partakers thereof. It is granted every twenty-fifth year, as also upon other extraordinary occasions, to such as, being truly penitent, shall worthily receive the blessed sacrament and perform the other conditions of fasting, alms, and prayer usually prescribed at such times.

What are the fruits or effects which usually are seen among Catholics at the time of a jubilee?

At that time the Church most pressingly invites all sinners to return to God with their whole hearts, and encourages them by setting open her spiritual treasure in their favor; so that the most usual effects of a jubilee are the conversions of great numbers of sinners, and the multiplying of all sorts of good works among the faithful. So far it is from being true that indulgences are an encouragement to sin, or an occasion of a neglect of good works, as our adversaries unjustly object.

What is irregularity?

It is a disability of becoming a cleric, or exercising clerical functions, occasioned either by nature or personal faults, ordained by the law for the greater honor of God and the sacred function.

How many defects render persons irregular?

Chiefly seven, namely: Of the mind, as gross ignorance, etc. Of the body, as eunuch, deformity, etc. Birth, as bastards, etc. Servitude, as slaves, etc. Want of age required by the Council

[1] Levit. xxv. 27.

of Trent. Again, bigamy; want of lenity, as murderers, hangmen, etc.

What criminal defects render persons irregular?

Chiefly five, namely, Rebaptizing; receiving or exercising spiritual functions contrary to the canons; heresy; all concerned in murder or voluntary mutilation; and an infamous life.

Does irregularity annul ordination?

No; it only renders the receiving and exercise unlawful and sinful.

How prove you that there is a power in the Church of excommunicating?

First, from the power of the keys; also from the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew, where it is said, "If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican" (verse 17). And from the Second Epistle of St. John, where he says, "Receive him not into the house, nor say unto him, Peace be to you" (verse 10). And likewise from the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, fifth chapter: "With such a one do not so much as eat" (verse 11); and in the same chapter, "Deliver such a one over to Satan" (verse 5).

EXTREME UNCTION

WHAT is extreme unction, and why so called?

Extreme unction is a sacrament that gives us grace to die well. It is administered by the anointment of the five senses of the sick person by a priest, under a certain form of words. It is called extreme because it is applied only to dying persons, and with respect to former unctions, as in baptism, confirmation, etc., it is the last.

How do you prove that this anointing of the sick is a sacrament? When, and by whom, was it instituted?

Because it is an outward sign of an inward and spiritual grace. The anointing, together with the prayers that accompany it, is the outward sign; the inward grace is the forgiveness of sins, promised in these words of St. James, "If he be in sins, they shall be

forgiven him" (chapter v, verse 15). It is uncertain when this sacrament was instituted. But the Council of Trent has declared that it was instituted by Christ, and promulgated by St. James in the fifth chapter of his Epistle, where it is commanded: "Is any one sick among you, let him call for the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall ease him; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him" (verses 14, 15). It is also intimated by St. Mark, in the sixth chapter, where it is said, "The apostles anointed with oil many that were sick" (verse 13).

What is the matter and form of this sacrament, who is the minister of it, and is it necessary for salvation?

The immediate matter is oil of olives, blessed by a bishop, as the Council of Trent declares. The form is these words: "By this holy unction, and his own most tender mercy, may the Lord pardon thee whatsoever sins thou hast committed by thy sight, by thy hearing," and so of the other senses. The only minister is a bishop or priest. And though the sacrament is not absolutely necessary, yet it is necessary both by divine and ecclesiastical law. All these points are declared by the words of St. James, above quoted.

Who may receive this sacrament?

Only adult persons, and such as are in danger of death by sickness or by wounds; but not infants, and such as are fools and always mad. Some divines say children of seven years of age may receive it, being capable of venial sin, though they never communicated.

Are persons to be anointed before a battle, or persons condemned, or in a shipwreck?

No.

When ought this sacrament to be given?

In every sickness, where there is danger of death: but it is to be observed that we ought not to defer it till the last hour, or agony of death; because it is much more profitable for the sick person to

receive it while he has leisure, reason, and memory to prepare himself for it.

How ought a person to prepare himself for this sacrament?

If he be in mortal sin, he must clear his conscience by a true and sincere confession. He ought also to make an act of contrition at the time he receives it, and to beg of God to forgive him the sins which he has committed by every organ or part that is anointed.

But suppose he has lost his speech, and therefore cannot confess his sins; what ought he then to do?

In that case he must make an act of contrition or sorrow for his sins, and give signs that he has a desire to obtain the forgiveness of them, and to receive the extreme unction.

Can this sacrament be given to persons out of their senses?

Yes; if they desired it before, or very probably would have desired it.

What parts are to be anointed?

The eyes, ears, nose, lips, hands, and feet, and in some cases the reins, but not in women. When any member is wanting, the nearest part is to be anointed.

What are the effects of this sacrament?

First, it remits all venial sins, and mortal sins forgotten; secondly, it remits something of the debt of punishment due to past sins; thirdly, it heals the soul of her infirmity and weakness, and a certain propension to sin, contracted by former sins, which are apt to remain in the soul as the unhappy relics of sin; fourthly, it gives strength and grace to the soul to bear with patience the pains and illness of the body, and it arms her against the temptations of her spiritual enemies; fifthly, it restores corporal health, if God sees it expedient for the good of the soul.

Can the same person receive this sacrament more than once?

Yes; but not in the same illness, unless it should be of long continuance, and that the state of the sick person should be changed, so as to recover out of danger, and then fall into the like case.

HOLY ORDERS

WHAT are holy orders?

Holy orders are a sacrament by which the ministers of Christ are ordained for their sacred functions, and receive grace to discharge them well.

How do you prove that holy orders are a sacrament?

Because they are a visible sign instituted by Christ to confer grace. The outward and visible sign is found in the imposition of the bishop's hands, and prayer,[1] after which manner we find the seven deacons were ordained; as also St. Paul and St. Barnabas. The invisible grace conferred by this imposition of hands is attested by St. Paul in his Second Epistle to Timothy, where he says, "Stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of my hands" (chapter i, verse 6). Hence it is evident that this sacrament was instituted by Christ; for the apostles of themselves could not annex the gift of grace to any outward sign or ceremony.

When did Christ institute this sacrament?

At his Last Supper, when he said to his apostles, "Do this for a commemoration of me."[2] And after his resurrection he confirmed it with a new power when, breathing on them, he said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained";[3] these two powers being the essential parts of priesthood, namely, to consecrate and offer the unbloody sacrifice of his body and blood, and to forgive sins.

Who is the minister of this sacrament?

A bishop only, as it is defined by the Council of Trent. Hence it says confirming and ordaining are not common to priests.[4]

Can any bishop confer orders?

Heretics and schismatics may validly, but not lawfully, ordain; yet, by the decree of the Council of Trent, no alien bishop can ordain priests without dismissory letters from the proper bishop.

[1] Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3. [2] Luke xxii. 19. [3] John xx. 22, 23. [4] Titus i. 5.

To whom does the right of mission, vocation, and election of the ministry belong?

To the pastors of the Church, namely, the bishops and the Pope.

But suppose some should pretend, as the first reformers did, to an extraordinary calling or mission?

Let them prove their extraordinary mission from God, by some miracles or the like, and then they say something to the purpose.

Is it lawful for any one to take upon him priestly power, without the ordination of the Catholic Church?

No, it is not; because it is usurping a power which no ways belongs to them; which we find has been severely chastised by Almighty God in the person of Ozias, as also in the persons of Core, Dathan, and Abiram.[1]

What need is there for ordaining those who have already the spirit of God in them, namely, the inward unction of the Holy Ghost, which of itself sufficiently authorizes any one to administer and preach the word of God without any further ceremony?

This doctrine was unheard of in the Church while it was governed by the apostles; for in those times we read that bishops, priests, and deacons were constantly ordained by the imposition of hands; nor was it lawful for any one to presume to preach and administer the sacraments unless he were first so ordained and sent by the lawful pastors of the Church.[2] Nay, even St. Paul and St. Barnabas, though they were immediately called to the apostleship by God himself, as the Scripture testifies: yet we see they were afterward ordained with the usual ceremony of laying on hands.[3] This extraordinary example, recorded in Holy Writ, is a most convincing proof that ordination is indispensably necessary to all who enter into the sacred ministry, since St. Paul himself was not excepted, who, if he had not been ordained, had not partaken of the priesthood. It is, therefore, a high and sacrilegious

[1] 2 Paral. xxvi. 19; Num. xvi. 32; etc.
[2] Acts xiv. 23; 1 Tim. iv. 14.
[3] Acts ix. 15; xiii. 2.

presumption for any man to take upon him to preach the Gospel, to administer the sacraments, and have the care of souls, unless he is first ordained and sent by those who were ordained, by lawful pastors in the Church, before him, according to the sacrament which Christ has instituted for that purpose: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber."[1] Now, it is evident that none but the bishops and priests of the Catholic Church derived their ordination and mission from the apostles; and that the pastors of all other churches have climbed up into the fold by another way.

What, and how many, are the conditions necessary for him who is to receive holy orders?

There are five principal ones.

Which is the first?

That he be called by God, as Aaron was;[2] so that he must not choose this holy state of his own head.

How shall a person know whether he be called by God?

If he has the conditions we are going to speak of, and if his spiritual director, after a due trial, counsels or advises him to it, then he may well presume he is called by God: yet, after all, he ought to fear and tremble; for Judas, though he was called by God himself, was miserably lost.[3]

Is it not sufficient that he has a great desire to be of the Church, and that his parents design him for it?

No; for it often happens that this great desire comes not from God, but either from the love of idleness and ease, or from an expectation of gaining honor and esteem in the world, or from some other disorderly passion, which deserves the curse of God. As for parents, they are often as worldly and as vain as their children; moreover, they are commonly ignorant of the obligations of a churchman, and of the dangers of this high calling; so that, as our Saviour said to the children of Zebedee and their mother, they know not what they ask.[4]

[1] John x. 1. [2] 1 Heb. v. 4. [3] Matt. x. 4; John xvii. 12. [4] Matt. xx. 22.

What is the second condition?

A resolution and sincere desire of spending his health and life in promoting the glory of God, and in working out his own salvation and that of his neighbors.

What is the third condition?

An honest, virtuous, and exemplary life.

What is the fourth condition?

He must be free even from all hidden mortal sins, at least for a long time before he receives this sacrament, and be in love and peace with God and man; for it is to the ministers of the Church God spoke, saying, "Be ye clean, who carry the vessels of the Lord."[1]

What is the fifth condition?

A learning and knowledge enough to instruct and guide others, both by word and example, according to the law of God and his Church; for God warns the ignorant, saying, "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee, that thou shalt not do the office of priesthood to me."[2] And it is to the ministers of the Church Christ says, "You are the light of the world. Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven."[3]

Which are the virtues that are most requisite in those persons who aspire to the ecclesiastical state?

The spirit or love of prayer, chastity, temperance, prudence, humility, contempt of the world, patience in adversity, fortitude or strength of mind, love of retirement, to be laborious and given to study.[4]

What persons are incapable of receiving holy orders?

All those who are not baptized, all hermaphrodites, and all women. "I permit not a woman to teach," says St. Paul.[5] Hence the Pepusiani, who ordained women, were declared heretics, as St. Epiphanius gives an account.

How many orders are there?

Only one total, but seven partial, which makes but one sacra-

[1] Levit. xxi. 8. [2] Osee iv. 6. [3] Matt. v. 13, 14.
[4] 1 Tim. iii.; 2 Tim. iii. [5] 1 Tim. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 34.

ment of ordination; for they have all a reference to, and are included in, priesthood.

How are they called?

Priest, deacon, subdeacon, acolyth, exorcist, lector, and porter.

Why are not bishops reckoned among the rest?

If you reckon episcopacy, then indeed there are eight orders; but commonly it is not named with the rest, because it is an eminent degree, which surpasseth them all, as being the source whence all the rest are derived; for they all proceed from it, and end in it; and as, in a kingdom, the king is not reckoned in the number of the officers that govern under him, because his power is transcendent, and runs through all the magistrates of the kingdom; so, in like manner, the bishop is not ordinarily reckoned in the number of the other orders, for he is in his Church, as the king in his kingdom, the prince and head of all ecclesiastical hierarchy, or holy principality.

What is the respective function of each order?

The office or function of a priest is to consecrate, or offer sacrifice, to forgive sins, administer the sacraments, and preach God's word, etc. A deacon is to assist the bishop or priest in the sacrifice of the Mass, to read the Gospel, etc. A subdeacon offers the sacred vessels to the deacon, and reads the epistle, etc. An acolyth prepares the cruets, and carries the lights, etc. An exorcist reads the exorcisms to expel the devil, etc. A lector reads the prophecies, etc. A porter takes care to admit none but the faithful into the Church, and keeps the Church decent.

Why are some orders called lesser, others greater? and which be they?

The greater orders are priesthood, deacon, and subdeacon: and they are so called because they regard the sacrifice immediately; the others, lesser, because more remotely.

Are all the orders called holy?

No; only the greater, for the reason given.

What is a hierarchy?

It is a holy government of sacred ministers—namely, bishops,

priests, and ministers—instituted by Christ for the sanctification of mankind.

Are the ministers all equal?

No; the Pope is, by divine right, the head, and bishops are by divine right above priests, both by the power of order and jurisdiction; that is, a bishop can ordain and confirm, and demand obedience over priests. (See St. Matthew xvi. 18, 19; St. John xxi. 15; St. Luke xxii; Philippians i. 1; 1 Timothy iii. 2; Titus i. 7; Acts xx. 28.)

Does not St. Hieronymus (Jerome) say that bishops and priests are the same?

No; on the contrary, he expressly says priests cannot ordain: indeed, he says in the beginning they were promiscuously styled presbyters, or seniors, in the Scriptures; and, moreover, that simple priests had a share in jurisdiction; but not that simple priests could claim jurisdiction by divine right. Hence the Arians were declared heretics for making priests and bishops equal.

What is the proper function of a bishop?

To govern in chief; to chastise the wicked and disobedient by excommunicating them; to preach and exhort; to administer the sacraments of confirmation and holy orders.

MATRIMONY [1]

What is matrimony?

It is a lawful contract between a man and a woman, whereby they deliver up a right to each other's bodies in order to propagate their species.

When was this contract first instituted?

It was first instituted by Almighty God, between our first parents in the earthly paradise; [2] and this institution was confirmed by Jesus Christ, in the New Testament, where he says, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." [3] And our

[1] For an historical consideration of marriage as a divine institution, see the following chapter.

[2] Genesis ii.

[3] Matt. xix. 6.

blessed Saviour, in order to show that this state is holy, and not to be condemned or despised, was pleased to honor it with his first miracle wrought at the marriage of Cana in Galilee.[1]

For what end was matrimony instituted?

For the procreation of children, that they may serve God here and people heaven hereafter; as also for a remedy against concupiscence, and for the benefit of conjugal society, that man and wife may mutually help each other, and contribute to each other's salvation.

Is matrimony a sacrament?

Yes.

How do you prove it to be a sacrament?

Because it is a conjunction made and sanctified by God himself, and not to be dissolved by any power of man; as being a sacred sign, or mysterious representation, of the indissoluble union of Christ and his Church. Hence, St. Paul expressly calls it a great sacrament,[2] or mystery, with regard to Christ and his Church. And the holy fathers all agree that it confers grace for the purposes above mentioned.

Was matrimony always a sacrament?

No; not till it was elevated to that dignity by Christ in the law of grace.

Is marriage between Jews and infidels, and persons unbaptized, a sacrament?

No: yet it is a natural contract among them, and obliges the parties as such.

What are the matter and form of this sacrament?

As the Church has not decided this point, there are two opinions concerning it: the one is, that the matter is the mutual delivery of their bodies; and the form, the words, or outward signs, whereby this delivery is accepted. Others, especially Melchior Cano, Estius, and Sylvius, think the delivery, or contract, to be the matter; but the form to be the words of the priest, "I join you together in matrimony," etc., or some other words equivalent.

[1] John ii. [2] Eph. v. 31, 32.

Now, the difference in these opinions is: the former makes the contractors to be the ministers of the sacrament, but the latter makes the priest to be the minister of the sacrament, and the contractors only ministers of the civil contract.

What is the effect of this sacrament?

It gives a special grace for the religious educating of children, and bearing with the difficulties and complying with the obligations of the state, and to be faithful and loving to each other.

How comes it, then, that so many marriages are unhappy, if mâtrimony be a sacrament which gives so great a grace?

Because the greater part do not receive it in the dispositions they ought: they consult not God in their choice, but only their own lust or temporal interest; they prepare not themselves for it, by putting themselves in the state of grace; and too often are guilty of freedoms before marriage which are not allowable by the law of God.

In what dispositions ought persons to receive this sacrament?

They ought to be in the state of grace, by confession; their intention ought to be pure, namely, to embrace this holy state for the ends for which God instituted it; and if they be under the care of parents, etc., they ought to consult them, and do nothing in this kind without their consent.

What are the obligations of the married couple?

First, to be united and live together during life.[1] Secondly, to be faithful to each other, as they have promised in marriage.[2] Thirdly, to assist each other in their distress; to bear patiently the indiscretion, weakness, and burdens of each other.[3] Fourthly, to get their children baptized as soon as possible, and to instruct and bring them up Christian-like.[4] Fifthly, to give good example to their children, and to their whole family, and to engage all to serve God, and pray to him, especially morning and evening.[5] Hence

[1] Mark x. [2] Gal. vi. 2; Col. iii. [3] 1 Cor. vii. 4, etc.
[4] Eph. vi. [5] 2 Cor. xii. 14.

all jealousies, bitterness, hatred, reproaches, contentions, scolding, fretfulness, abuses, and excessive love of their children and the world, are to be avoided; as, also, all immoderate affection, without reason or decency, for each other, whereby they make slight account of the law and love of God.[1] Again, the wife is obliged to be submissive and obedient to her husband in all things that are not contrary to the law of God; for the man is the head of the woman, as Christ is the head of the Church.[2] She must likewise be careful that she does not miscarry through her own fault; nor must she let the infant sleep in the same bed with her, or its nurse, for the space of a twelvemonth, for fear it should be overlaid.[3] The husband is obliged to be loving and careful of his wife, and provide for her and his family.[4]

Can man and wife separate or break the marriage contract, so as to be at liberty to marry another?

There are several cases wherein they may separate, as to cohabitation, with the approbation of the Church; but the contract can never be broken or annulled so as to have liberty to marry again, as the Council of Trent has defined against late heretics, who allow of parting and remarrying, in case of adultery.

Can marriage be dissolved (*quoad vinculum*) by a person's entering into religion?

The Council of Trent has declared that if the marriage be not consummated, it may be annulled by entering into religion; and the reason is because as yet they are not one flesh.

Were not the Jews accustomed to break the marriage contract, and marry again?

Such a custom was permitted by their law (upon account of the hardness of their hearts),[5] and a bill of divorce granted in some cases; but they abused the law, extending it to cases not allowed of; besides, it was not approved of, but only permitted by divine appointment. However, our Saviour recalled that law.[6]

Is it lawful to have more wives than one?

[1] 1 Peter iii. 1. [2] Eph. v. [3] Rom. Rit.
[4] Eph. v. 28, etc. [5] Matt. xix. 8. [6] Mark x.

No; for it is expressly forbid by the law of God. (See St. Matthew xix; St. Mark x; St. Luke xvi; 1 Corinthians vi.)

Did not the ancient patriarchs keep several wives at the same time?

This was done by divine dispensation, as the Council of Trent (following St. Augustine, etc.) declares; polygamy not being against a first, but only a secondary precept of the law of nature, which God can dispense with. However, it never was permitted for a woman to have more husbands than one, this being against the first precept of the law of nature, namely, the procreation of children, which would be obstructed thereby.

Are all persons qualified to enter into the contract of marriage?

No; because sometimes the contract may be against the law of nature, the law of God, and human laws, both civil and ecclesiastical.

Is the contract void where persons lie under incapacity from those laws?

Impediments are of two kinds: some annul the contract; others only render the contract unlawful.

Has the Church power to appoint those impediments?

Yes; for so it is expressly defined by the Council of Trent.

Which are the chief impediments rendering the contract of marriage illegal?

First, a simple vow of chastity, or to become religious. Secondly, espousals with another, or a mutual promise of future marriage. Thirdly, to solemnize marriage on days prohibited by the Church.

In what cases are espousals dissolvable?

By mutual consent; by marriage; by entrance into religion; a long absence, not returning at the time appointed, or thereabouts; want of age; affinity or consanguinity supervening; a notable deformity of body happening after; fornication; heresy supervening; if any condition promised is not fulfilled; a capital crime; holy orders; an insupportably cruel temper; if anything happens

after which would have hindered the promise. Yet in all these cases the Church is to be consulted.

At what time is the solemnization of marriage prohibited by the Church?

From the first Sunday in Advent till the Epiphany, or Twelfth Day, be past; and from Ash Wednesday till after Low Sunday.

Which are the chief impediments that render the contract of marriage null?

Holy orders, or solemn profession in any religious order; or if the contract is between persons akin, either in affinity or consanguinity, namely, within the fourth degree; again, if either party be not baptized; as also clandestine marriages, that is, without the parish priest or one deputed by him, and at least two witnesses (but this is only an impediment where the Council of Trent is received).

How far is the consent of parents requisite in marriage?

It is a great sin to marry without their knowledge and consent, unless there be plain reasons not to ask it: for the Scripture everywhere mentions parents giving their children in marriage. However, the Council of Trent has decreed that marriage without their consent is valid.

Does the Catholic Church allow those of her communion to marry with those who are of a different communion?

She has often prohibited such marriages, as may be seen in the councils of Illiberis, Laodicea, Chalcedon, Agde, etc. And the reason is: First, because she would not have her children communicate in sacred things, such as matrimony is, with those that are out of her communion. Secondly, because such marriages are apt to give occasion to disturbances in families, while one of the parties draws one way, and the other another. Thirdly, because there is a danger of the Catholic party being perverted, or at least of not being allowed the free exercise of religion. Fourthly, because there is a danger of the children being brought up in error, of which we have seen several bad instances. However, sometimes, and in some places, the pastors of the Church, for weighty reasons,

have been forced to dispense with this law, and tolerate such marriages. But it is to be observed that those bargains are by no means to be allowed of, by which the contracting parties agree to have the boys brought up in the religion of the father, and the girls to follow the mother; for God and his Church will have no such division, nor give up their right to any one.

CHAPTER XXXIII

MARRIAGE—KEYSTONE OF THE SOCIAL FABRIC

Christian marriage the basis of the Christian home—Indissolubility of the marriage-tie—Nature of marriage—As defined by the Master of Sentences—Evils of polygamy—Marriage as a sacrament—So defined by the Council of Trent—As viewed by St. Cyril, St. Augustine, and St. Paul—The perfect antitype of Christ's union with his Church—St. Ambrose on the sanctity of the marriage bond—Sacramental grace conferred—Marriage a sacrament instituted by Christ—View of Melchior Cano adopted by other theologians and scholars—Opinion of Tertullian—Allocution of Pius IX—Validity of marriage—The Church on divorce—The law of Israel on the subject—Rabbinical disputes—Divorce in Athens and in Rome under the empire—Pharisaic immorality condemned, and the Mosaic dispensation annulled, by our Lord—Catholic view of the marriage bond—Divorce as dealt with by Christian princes—As viewed by the fathers—Erroneous views of Lutherans and Calvinists—Unity of marriage—The banns—Ceremonies of marriage—The Church on mixed marriages.

THE basis of the Christian home is Christian marriage; that is, marriage entered into according to religion, and cemented by God's blessing. So great is the importance of marriage to the temporal and eternal welfare of mankind, that, as it had God for its Founder in the Old Law, so, in the New Law, it was raised by our Divine Lord to the dignity of a sacrament of the Christian religion. Natural likings and instincts have their own value and weight; but they ought not by themselves to be a decisive motive in so important a step as Christian marriage; nor are they a safe guarantee for the proper fulfilment of the high ends for which marriage was ordained. That Christian hearts and lives may be wisely and rightly joined, God must join them, and religion sanctify the union; and though the Church sometimes permits the contracting of mixed marriages, she never does so without regret and without a feeling of anxiety for the future happiness of that union and for the eternal salvation of its offspring.

The security of the Christian home is in the indissolubility of

the marriage-tie. Christian marriage, once consummated, can never be dissolved save by death. Let it be well understood that even adultery, though it may justify "separation from bed and board," cannot loose the marriage-tie so that either of the parties may marry again during the life of the other. Nor has "legal divorce" the slightest power, before God, to loose the bond of marriage and to make a subsequent marriage valid. "Whom God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." [1] In common with all Christian believers and friends of civilization, we deplore the havoc wrought by the divorce laws of our country. These laws are fast loosening the foundations of society. Let Catholics, at least, remember that such divorces are powerless in conscience. Let them enter into marriage only through worthy and holy motives, and with the blessings of religion, especially with the blessing of the Nuptial Mass. And then, far from wishing for means of escape from their union, they will rejoice that it cannot be divided but by death.[2]

NATURE OF MARRIAGE

Marriage is a natural contract between man and woman, which Christ has raised to the dignity of a sacrament. Heathen may be, and are, united in true marriage, and their union is of course a lawful one, sanctioned and blessed by God himself, who is the Author of nature as well as of grace. But it is only among baptized persons that the contract of marriage is blessed and sanctified in such a manner as to become a means of conferring grace; so that we must distinguish between marriage in itself, or according to the natural law, on the one hand, and the sacrament of marriage, on the other. Theologians commonly give the following definition of marriage, taken from the Master of Sentences.[3] It is "viri mulierisque conjunctio maritalis inter legitimas personas individu-

[1] Matt. xix. 6.

[2] From Pastoral Letter of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, December 7, 1884.

[3] Peter Lombard (Latin, Petrus Lombardus), an Italian theologian, born at Novara, Italy, about 1100. He was appointed Bishop of Paris in 1159, and was surnamed "Master of Sentences" from his work "Sententiarum libri IV" ("Four Books of Sentences"). He died at Paris in 1160.

THE HOLY FAMILY

FROM THE PAINTING BY JULES ROMAIN

am vitæ societatem retinens." It is "conjunctio viri et mulieris"—namely, the union of man and woman, the persons between whom the contract is formed; it is "maritalis"—that is, it implies the giving to each power over the person of the other, and so is distinct from the union of friend with friend, man with man in business, and the like; it is "inter legitimas personas"—namely, between those who are not absolutely prevented by lawful impediment from contracting such a union; "individuam vitæ societatem retinens"—it binds them to an undivided and indissoluble partnership during life, and so is distinct from such unhallowed unions as are contracted for a time or may be ended at will. If we add, "gratiam conjugibus conferendam significans"—that is, being an (efficacious) sign of grace to be bestowed on the persons contracting—we have the full definition of marriage as a sacrament. Of course, the definition gives the bare essentials of marriage, for it ought to include the most perfect union of heart and soul, sympathy and interest.

Two points in the above definition may cause some difficulty, since it assumes that even in the law of nature a man can have only one wife (and of course a woman only one husband), and, further, that by the same law the marriage-tie lasts till death.

With regard to the former point, polygamy, according to St. Thomas,[1] does not absolutely destroy the end of marriage, for it is possible that a man with several wives should protect them and provide for the education of his children. And therefore (as many theologians suppose), from the time of the Deluge, God allowed the patriarchs and others, whether Jews or heathen, to have more wives than one. But polygamy cruelly injures the perfect union of marriage; it degrades man by sensuality, and exposes woman to the miseries of jealousy and neglect; it endangers the welfare of the children, and so may be justly stigmatized as contrary to the law of nature. Moreover, monogamy alone is contemplated in the institution of marriage: "Therefore a man will leave his father and his mother, and will cleave to his wife, and they shall

[1] Suppl., lxv. 1.

be one flesh."[1] The legislation in Deuteronomy xxv. 5 *et seq.* appears to assume that monogamy was the rule among the Hebrews; so does the Book of Proverbs throughout, and particularly the beautiful description of the good wife in chapter xxxi,[2] and the same idea pervades the noble poetry of Psalm cxxviii (see also, in the Deutero-canonical books, Tobias i. 11; Ecclesiasticus xxvi. 1). It was not till 1020 A.D. that a law of Rabbi Gershon ben Judah, in the Synod of Worms, absolutely prohibited polygamy among the Western Jews. It was practised by the Jews of Castile even in the fourteenth century, and still survives among the Jews of the East.[3] Our Lord himself expounded and enforced the natural law of marriage, and recalled men to the idea of marriage given in Genesis. It is worth noticing that he quotes the Septuagint text, which is more express in favor of monogamy than the Hebrew: "And *the two* shall be one flesh." (So also the Samaritan והיה משניהם, "and there shall be from the two of them one flesh"; the New Testament invariably, Mark x. 8; 1 Corinthians vi. 16; Ephesians v. 31; and the Vulgate. The Targum of Onkelos, on the other hand, exactly follows the Hebrew.) Again, since Christ spoke generally of all mankind, and not simply of those who were to be members of his Church, theologians hold that he withdrew the former dispensation, and consequently that polygamy is unlawful and a violation of natural law even in heathen.[4]

The same principles apply to the second point of difficulty. Moses, our Lord declares, permitted divorce because of the hardness of men's hearts, that is, to prevent greater evils; and in consequence of this dispensation it was perhaps lawful for the heathen to imitate the example of the Jews in this respect also. But here, too, Christ has recalled all mankind to the primitive institution. The apparent exception which our Lord makes will be considered below.

[1] Genesis i. 24.

[2] The estimate of woman is high throughout the Old Testament. We need only remind the reader of Mary the sister of Moses, Deborah, Anna. See also Proverbs xiv. 1; xviii. 22; xix. 14 (even xxi. 9, 19, are not really different in spirit). The most unfavorable judgment is that of Ecclesiastes vii. 27, 29.

[3] Kalisch on Exodus, p. 370; on Leviticus, p. 374. [4] Billuart, De Matrimon., diss. v. a. 1.

MARRIAGE AS A SACRAMENT

A SACRAMENT is an outward sign, and nobody doubts that in marriage, as in all other contracts, some outward sign on the part of the contracting parties is necessary. They must signify their consent to the solemn obligation of living together as man and wife. It is plain, too, that marriage may be called a sacred sign, for it typifies, as St. Paul assures us, the mysterious union between Christ and the Church which is his bride.[1] But is it an efficacious sign of grace? That is, is the contract of marriage accompanied by signs which not only betoken, but necessarily, in consequence of Christ's institution, convey grace to all baptized persons who do not wilfully impede the entrance of the grace into their hearts? This is a question on which Catholics are divided from Protestants, and which was agitated among Catholics themselves late even in the middle ages. St. Thomas, though he assumes that marriage is a sacrament of the new law, inquires whether it "confers grace," and mentions three opinions: first, that it does not do so at all, and this opinion he dismisses at once; next, that it confers grace only in the sense that it makes acts lawful that would otherwise be sins (this opinion he also rejects, but in a less summary way); and, thirdly, that when "contracted in the faith of Christ," it confers grace to fulfil the duties of the married state, and this opinion he accepts as "more probable."[2] It is plain that all which the second opinion attributes to marriage may be truly said of marriage as a natural contract, and does not by any means amount to a confession that marriage is a Christian sacrament in the sense of the Council of Trent. What St. Thomas gives as the more probable opinion is now an article of faith, for the council, after stating that Christ himself merited for us a grace which perfects the natural love of marriage and strengthens its indissoluble unity, solemnly defines (Canon 1) that marriage is "truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law instituted by Christ."[3]

[1] Ephes. v. [2] Suppl., xlii. a. 3. [3] Sess. xxiv, De Sacram. Matr.

The same council speaks of Scripture as insinuating (*innuit*) this truth, and more can scarcely be said. One text, indeed, as translated in our Douay Bible, would certainly seem to settle the question—namely, Ephesians v. 31, 32, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall adhere to his wife; and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church." But we cannot strictly claim this to be the true sense of the Vulgate, "Sacramentum hoc magnum est; ego autem dico in Christo et in ecclesia," which exactly answers to the original Greek, except that "in Christo et in ecclesia" would be better rendered as in the old Latin of Tertullian, "in Christum et in ecclesiam."[1] "Sacramentum" need not mean a "sacrament" any more than the Greek *mysterion* which it represents, and to prove this we need not go beyond the text of the Vulgate itself, which speaks of the "sacramentum" of godliness (1 Timothy iii. 16); the "sacramentum" of the seven stars; the "sacramentum" of the woman and the beast (Apocalypse i. 20; xvii. 7). Indeed, though the word "sacramentum" occurs in fifteen other places of the Vulgate, it cannot possibly mean a sacrament in any one of them. We translate, accordingly, "This mystery is great, but I speak with reference to Christ and the Church"—that is, the words, "For this cause shall a man leave," etc., contain a hidden or mysterious sense,[2] in virtue of which St. Paul regards Adam's words about the union between man and wife as a type or prophecy of the union between Christ and his Church. We have the authority of Estius for this interpretation, which is that generally adopted by modern scholars, and he denies that the ancients appealed to this text to prove marriage a sacrament.

On the other hand, St. Cyril says that Christ was present at the wedding in Cana of Galilee that he might sanctify the principle of man's generation, "drive away the old sadness of child-bearing," and "give grace to those also who were to be born;" and he quotes

[1] Contr. Marc., v. 18; De Anima, 11.

[2] The formula, "This is a great mystery," is a common Rabbinical one, רזא רזא יקירא (see Schoettgen, Horæ, p. 783 *et seq.*); and the same Chaldee word for "mystery" is preserved in the Peshito rendering of the verse.

the words of St. Paul, "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; old things have passed away." [1]

St. Augustine holds similar language.[2] This theory, however credible in itself, certainly does not lie on the surface of St. John's narrative.

More may be made of 1 Timothy ii. 11 *et seq.*: "Let a woman learn in quietness, in all subjection. But teaching I do not permit to a woman, nor to have authority over a man, but to be in quietness. For man was first formed, then Eve, and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived hath fallen into transgression; but she shall be saved through her child-bearing,[3] if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with temperance." St. Paul excludes women from the public ministry of the Church, and reserves that for men. But he assigns them another ministry instead. They are to save their own souls by the faithful discharge of their duties as wives, and to be the source of the Church's increase, for it cannot subsist without marriage any more than without the sacrament of orders. Women are to be the mothers of children, whom they are to tend and train for the service of Christ. And just as a special grace is given to those whom God calls to the priestly state, so is "the state of marriage placed under the protection and blessing of a special grace, as being dedicated to the Church and subserving its continual growth and expansion." Thus the intercourse of the sexes, which is apt to become a source of fearful corruption, is blessed and sanctified, more even than in its primitive institution, and directed to a still higher end, that of carrying on the Church's life on earth. The natural union is holy and beautiful: Christ perfects the union of heart and soul and makes it still more holy and beautiful by sacramental grace; and, hallowed by a sacrament, marriage becomes the perfect antitype of Christ's union with his Church. He cleansed his Church that he might unite it to himself. He sanctifies Christian man and woman

[1] Lib. ii. in Joann.

[2] Tract. 9 in Joann. cap. 2.

[3] Bishop Ellicott translates "through the child-bearing," that is, through the birth of Christ. It seems to us incredible that St. Paul, if he really meant this, should have expressed it by an allusion so obscure and abrupt.

in their union that it may be "a hallowed copy of his own union with his Church."[1]

We do not allege this last passage as conclusive from a controversial point of view, though it fits in well with the Catholic doctrine. Many authorities are alleged from tradition, one or two of which we have already given in speaking of the marriage at Cana. St. Ambrose says that he who is unfaithful to the marriage bond "undoes grace, and because he sins against God, therefore loses the share in a heavenly mystery (*sacramenti cœlestis consortium amittit*)."[2] St. Augustine writes: "The advantage of marriage among all nations and men lies in its being a cause of generation and a bond of chastity, but, as concerns the people of God, also in the holiness of a sacrament (*in sanctitate sacramenti*)."[3] Here the distinction drawn between natural and Christian marriage, and, still more, the comparison made between the "sacramenta" of marriage and orders,[4] seem to warrant our rendering of "sanctitate sacramenti."

SACRAMENTAL GRACE CONFERRED

Marriage, then, is a sacrament of the new law, and as such confers grace. The sacrament can be received only by those who have already received baptism, the gate of all the other sacraments; and marriage is not, like baptism and penance, instituted for the cleansing of sin, so that grace is conferred on those, and those only, who are at peace with God. Christians who are in mortal sin may contract a valid marriage, but they receive no grace, though they do receive the sacrament and therefore have a claim and title to the sacramental grace when they have amended their lives by sincere repentance. Christians, on the other hand, who contract marriage with due dispositions receive an increase of sanctifying grace,

[1] Döllinger, First Age of the Church (trans.), pp. 361, 362.

[2] De Abraham, i. 7. [3] De Bono Conjugali, cap. 24.

[4] He says the "sacramentum ordinationis" remains in a cleric deposed for crime, and that so the bond of marriage is loosed only by death. However, cap. 18 proves that St. Augustine did not use the word "sacramentum" in its precise modern sense, for he calls the polygamy of the Jews "sacramentum pluralium nuptiarum," as typifying the multitude of converts to the Church.

and, besides, special graces, which enable them to live in mutual and enduring affection, to bear with each other's infirmities, to be faithful to each other in every thought, and to bring up the children whom God may give them in his fear and love. They may go confidently to God for every help they need in that holy state to which he has deigned to call them, for he himself has sealed their union by a great sacrament of the Gospel. Theologians are not agreed as to the time when Christ instituted the sacrament. Some say at the wedding in Cana; others, when he abrogated the liberty of divorce;[1] others, in the great Forty Days after Easter.

If we ask, further, how this grace is conferred, or, in other words, who are the ministers of the sacrament, what are the words and other signs through which it is given, the answer is far from easy. It is evident that there must be a real consent to the marriage on both sides, otherwise there can be no contract and therefore no sacrament. But is the expression of mutual consent enough? The great majority of mediæval theologians, though William of Paris is quoted on the other side, answered yes. They held that wherever baptized persons contracted marriage, they necessarily received the sacrament of marriage also. On this theory, the parties themselves are the ministers of the sacrament; the matter consists in the words or other signs by which each gives himself or herself over to the other; the form, which gives a determinate character to the matter, consists in the acceptation of this surrender by each of the contracting parties. Hence, wherever Christians bind themselves by outward signs to live as man and wife, they receive the sacrament of marriage. No priest or religious ceremony of any kind is needed. A very different view was put forward in the sixteenth century by Melchior Cano.[2] He held that the priest was the minister of the sacrament; the expressed consent to live as man and wife constituted the matter of the sacrament; the words of the priest, "I join you in marriage," or the like, the necessary form. A marriage not contracted in the face of the Church would, on this theory, be a true and valid marriage, but not

[1] Matt. xix.

[2] Loci. Theol., viii. 5.

a sacrament. Theologians and scholars of learning and reputation, for example, Sylvius, Estius, Tournely, Juenin, Renaudot, and others, embraced this opinion.[1] In its defence an appeal might be made with great plausibility to the constant usage of Christians from the earliest times, for they have always been required to celebrate marriage before the priest. But it is to be observed that Tertullian, strong as his language is against marriages not contracted before the Church, says that such unions "are in danger" (*periclitantur*) of being regarded as no better than concubinage, which implies that they were not really so.[2] Nor does he make any distinction between the contract of marriage in Christians and the sacrament, though it would have been much to his purpose could he have done so. Besides, the language of the fathers quoted above points to a belief that Christ elevated the contract of marriage to a sacrament, not that he superadded the sacrament to marriage. Moreover, Denzinger shows that the Nestorians, who have retained the nuptial benediction from the Church and believe in the obligation of securing it, still consider that marriage, even as a sacred rite, may be performed by the parties themselves if the priest cannot be had; and he quotes from Gregorius Datheviensis this dictum: "Marriage is effected through consent expressed in words, but perfected and consummated by the priest's blessing and by cohabitation."[3] Now, at all events, the former of the two opinions given is the only tenable one in the Church. Pius IX, in an allocution, September 27, 1852, laid down the principle that there "can be no marriage among the faithful which is not at one and the same time a sacrament"; and among the condemned propositions of the Syllabus appended to the Encyclical "Quanta Cura" of 1864, the sixty-fourth runs thus: "The sacrament of marriage is something accessory to and separable from the contract, and the sacrament itself depends simply on the nuptial benediction." Whether, supposing a Christian (having obtained a dispensation to that effect) were to marry a person who is not baptized, the Christian party

[1] Billuart, De Matrim., diss. i. a. 6.
[2] De Pudic., 4.
[3] Ritus Orientales, tom. i, pp. 152 *et seq.*

would receive the sacrament as well as enter into the contract of marriage, is a matter on which theologians differ. Analogy seems to favor the affirmative opinion

VALIDITY OF MARRIAGE

THE conditions for the validity of marriage are mostly identical with the conditions which determine the validity of contracts in general. The consent to the union must be mutual, voluntary, deliberate, and manifested by external signs. The signs of consent need not be verbal in order to make the marriage valid, though the rubric of the Ritual requires the consent to be expressed in that manner. The consent must be to actual marriage then and there, not at some future time; for in the latter case we should have engagement to marry, or betrothal, not marriage itself. Consent to marry if a certain condition in the past or present be realized (for example, "I take you, ——, for my wife, if you are the daughter of —— and ——"), suffices, supposing that the condition be fulfilled. Nay, it is generally held that if a condition be added dependent on future contingencies (for example, "I take you, ——, for my wife, if your father will give you such and such a dowry"), the marriage becomes a valid one, without any renewal of the contract, whenever the condition becomes a reality. The condition appended, however, must not be contrary to the essence of marriage—for example, a man cannot take a woman for his wife, to have and to hold just as long as he pleases.[1]

DIVORCE

DIVORCE, in its widest sense, signifies a separation made between man and wife on sufficient grounds and by lawful authority. It may dissolve the marriage bond altogether, so that the man or woman is free to contract a fresh marriage (*separatio quoad vinculum*); or it may simply relieve one of the parties from the obligation of living with the other (*separatio quoad torum et mensam*).

[1] Gury, Theol. Moral., de Matrimon., cap. iii.

No human power can dissolve the bond of marriage when ratified and consummated between baptized persons. But—

(1) The marriage bond may be dissolved, even between baptized persons, by Papal authority, if the marriage has not been consummated. Such at least is the common doctrine of canonists and theologians; nor does Billuart, who holds the opposite opinion, deny that such divorces have been granted by Martin V, Paul III, Pius IV, and Gregory XIII.

(2) It may be dissolved in similar circumstances by the solemn religious profession of either party. This point was defined at Trent;[1] the principle having been already laid down by Innocent III, who professed to follow the example of his predecessors, and being justified by the example of ancient saints, who left their brides before consummation of marriage to lead a life of perpetual continence. The engagement by which they bound themselves to continence may be considered equivalent to a solemn religious profession in later times.

(3) If two unbaptized persons have contracted marriage, this marriage, even if consummated, may be dissolved, supposing one of the parties embraces the Christian religion and the other refuses to live peaceably and without insult to the Christian religion in the married state. This principle is laid down by Innocent III, and is founded on the "dispensation of the apostle," as it is called, in 1 Corinthians vii. 12–15.

In all other cases the marriage bond is indissoluble, and, besides this, married persons are bound to live together as man and wife. They may, however, separate by mutual consent; and, again, if one party exposes the other to grave danger of body or soul, or commits adultery, the innocent partner may obtain a judicial separation, or even refuse to cohabit without waiting for the sentence of the judge, provided always that the offence is clearly proved. If the innocent party has condoned the adultery, the right of separation on that ground is forfeited—unless, of course, the offence is repeated.[2]

[1] Sess. xxiv, can. 6.

[2] Billuart; St. Liguori; Gury, Theol. Moral., de Matrimon.

The law of Israel (Deuteronomy xxiv. 1) allowed a man to divorce his wife if she did not find grace in his eyes, because he found in her some shameful thing (ערות דבר, literally the "nakedness or shame of a thing"; Septuagint, *aschemon pragma*; Vulgate, *aliquam fœditatem*), and the woman was free at once to marry another man. The school of Shammai kept to the simple meaning of the text. Hillel thought any cause of offence sufficient for divorce—for example, "if a woman let the broth burn"; while R. Akiva held that a man might divorce his wife if he found another woman handsomer. (See the quotation from "Arbah Turim Nilchoth Gittin," i., in McCaul, "Old Paths," page 189.) The Pharisees tried to entangle Christ in these Rabbinical disputes when they asked him if a man might put away his wife "for any cause." In Athens, and in Rome under the empire, the liberty of divorce reached the furthest limits of Rabbinical license. (See Döllinger, "Gentile and Jew" (trans.), II. pp. 236 *et seq.*, 254 *et seq.*) Our Lord, as we have already seen, condemned the Pharisaic immorality, annulled the Mosaic dispensation, and declared, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery, and he who marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery."[1] The Catholic understands our Lord to mean that the bond of marriage is always, even when one of the wedded parties has proved unfaithful, indissoluble; and from the first Christ's declaration made the practice of Christians with regard to divorce essentially and conspicuously different from those of their heathen and Jewish neighbors. Still, it was only by degrees that the strict practice, or even the strict theory just stated, was accepted in the Church.

Christian princes had, of course, to deal with the subject of divorce, but they did not at once recast the old laws on Christian principles. Constantine, Theodosius the Younger, and Valentinian III forbade divorce except on certain specified grounds; other emperors, like Anastasius (in 497) and Justin (whose law was in force till 900), permitted divorce by mutual consent, but no one

[1] Matt. xix. 9.

emperor limited divorce to the single case of adultery. Chardon says that divorce (of course, *a vinculo*) was allowed among the Ostrogoths in Spain till the thirteenth century, in France under the first and second dynasties, in Germany till the seventh century, in Britain till the tenth.[1]

It would be waste of labor to accumulate quotations from the fathers in proof of their belief that divorce was unlawful except in the case of adultery. But it is very important to notice that the oldest tradition, both of the Greek and Latin Churches, regarded marriage as absolutely indissoluble. Thus, Hermas (lib. ii. Mand. iv. c. 1), Athenagoras ("Legat.," 33) (whose testimony, however, does not count for much, since he objected to second marriages altogether), and Tertullian ("De Monog.," 9), who speaks in this place, as the context shows, for the Catholic Church, teach this clearly and unequivocally. The principle is recognized in the Apostolic Canons (Canon 48, al. 47), by the Council of Elvira held at the beginning of the fourth century, Canon 9 (which, however, only speaks of a woman who has left an unfaithful husband), and by other early authorities.

However the Eastern Christians, though not, as we have seen, in the earliest times, came to understand our Lord's words as permitting a second marriage in the case of adultery, which was supposed to dissolve the marriage bond altogether. Such is the view and practice of the Greeks and Oriental sects at the present day. And even in certain parts of the West similar views prevailed for a time. Many French synods (for example, those of Vannes in 465 and of Compiègne in 756) allow the husband of a wife who has been unfaithful to marry again in her lifetime. Nay, the latter council permitted remarriage in other cases: if a woman had a husband struck by leprosy and got leave from him to marry another, or if a man had given his wife leave to go into a convent (Canons 16 and 19). Pope Gregory II, in a letter to St. Boniface in the year 726, recommended that the husband of a wife seized by sickness which prevented cohabitation should not marry again, but left him

[1] Chardon, Hist. des Sacrements, tom. v, Mariage, ch. v.

free to do so provided he maintained his first wife.[1] At Florence the question of divorce was discussed between the Latins and the Greeks, but after the Decree of Union; and we do not know what answers the Greeks gave on the matter. The Council of Trent confirmed the present doctrine and discipline, which had long prevailed in the West, in the following words: "If any man say that the Church is in error because it has taught and teaches, following the doctrine of the Gospels and the Apostles, that the bond of marriage cannot be dissolved because of the adultery of one or both parties, let him be anathema."[2] The studious moderation of language here is obvious, for the canon does not directly require any doctrine to be accepted; it only anathematizes those who condemn a certain doctrine, and implies that this doctrine is taught by the Church and derived from Christ. It was the Venetian ambassadors who prevailed on the fathers to draw up the canon in this indirect form, so as to avoid needless offence to the Greek subjects of Venice in Cyprus, Candia, Corfu, Zante, and Cephalonia. The canon was, no doubt, chiefly meant to stem the erroneous views of Lutherans and Calvinists on divorce.

Our Lord's utterances on the subject of divorce present some difficulty. In Mark x. 11, 12, and Luke xvi. 18, he absolutely prohibits divorce: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her; and if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery." But in Matthew xix. 9, 10, there is a marked difference: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and marry another, committeth adultery; and he who marrieth a woman put away, committeth adultery." So also Matthew v. 32. Protestant commentators understand our Lord to prohibit divorce except in the case of adultery, when the innocent party at least may marry again. Maldonatus, who acknowledges the difficulty of the text, takes the sense to be: "Whoever puts away his wife, except for infidelity, commits adultery, because of the danger of falling into licentiousness to which he unjustly exposes her, and so does he who

[1] Quoted by Hefele, Beiträge, II. 376.

[2] Sess. xxiv, De Matrim., can. 5.

in any case, even if his wife has proved unfaithful, marries another." He takes St. Mark and St. Luke as explanatory of the obscure passage in St. Matthew. Subsequent scholars, we venture to think, have by no means improved on Maldonatus. Hug, who is never to be mentioned without respect, suggested that Christ first (in Matthew v. 32) forbade divorce except in case of adultery; then (Matthew xix. 9, 10) forbade it altogether, the words "except for fornication" in the latter place being an interpolation—a suggestion perfectly arbitrary and followed by nobody. A well-known Catholic commentator, Schegg, interprets the words "for fornication" (*epi porneia*) to mean, "because the man has found his marriage to be null because of some impediment, and so no marriage at all, but mere concubinage." In this event there would be no occasion for or possibility of divorce. On Matthew v. 32 (*parektos logou porneias*, save where fornication is the motive reason of the divorce) he thinks Christ took for granted that the adulteress would be put to death (according to Leviticus xx. 10) and so leave her husband free, an hypothesis which is contradicted by the "pericope of the adulteress" (John viii. 3 *et seq.*). Döllinger's elaborate theory, given in the appendix to his "First Age of the Church," is less ingenious than that of Hug, but scarcely less arbitrary. He urges that *porneuein* can refer only to "fornication," and cannot be used of sin committed after marriage; but *porneia* and *porneuein* are used of adultery,[1] so that we need not linger over Döllinger's contention (which has no historical basis, and is objectionable in every way) that antenuptial sin on the woman's part annulled the union and left the man free, if he was unaware of it when he meant to contract marriage.

UNITY OF MARRIAGE

The unlawfulness of polygamy in the common sense of the word follows from the declaration of Christ himself, and there is no room for further question on the matter. With regard to reit-

[1] 1 Cor. 1; Amos vii. 17; Sir. xxiii. 33.

eration of marriage, St. Paul (1 Corinthians vii. 39, 40) distinctly asserts that a woman is free to marry on her husband's death. Still, there is a natural feeling against a second marriage, which Virgil expresses in the beautiful words he puts into Dido's mouth—

> Ille meos, primus qui me sibi junxit, amores
> Abstulit; ille habeat secum servetque sepulcro.

And this feeling, of which there are many traces among the heathen, was yet more natural in Christians, who might well look to a continuance in a better world of the love which had begun and grown stronger year by year on earth. Moreover, the apostle puts those who had married again at a certain disadvantage, for he excludes them (1 Timothy iii. 2; Titus i. 6) from the episcopate and priesthood. And the Church, though she held fast the lawfulness of second marriage and condemned the error of the Montanists (see Tertullian, "De Monog.," "Exhortat. Castitatis") and of some Novatians (Concil. Nic., i. Canon 8), treated such unions with a certain disfavor. This aversion was much more strongly manifested in the East than in the West.

Athenagoras says Christians marry not at all, or only once, since they look on second marriage as a "specious adultery" (*euprepes esti moicheia*).[1] Clement of Alexandria ("Strom.," iii. 1, p. 551, ed. Potter) simply repeats the apostolic injunction, "But as to second marriage, if thou art on fire, says the apostle, marry." (In iii. 12, p. 551, he is referring to simultaneous bigamy.) Early in the fourth century we find Eastern councils showing strong disapproval of second marriage. Thus the Council of Neocæsarea (Canon 7) forbids priests to take part in the feasts of those who married a second time, and assumes that the latter must do penance. The Council of Ancyra (Canon 19) also takes this for granted, and the Council of Laodicea (Canon 1) only admits those who have married again to communion after prayer and fasting. Basil treats this branch of Church discipline in great detail. For those who married a second time he prescribes, following ancient precedent,

[1] Legat., 33.

a penance of one year, and of several years for those who marry more than once. (See the references in Hefele, "Concil.," i. 339; "Beiträge," i. 50 *et seq.*) Basil's rigorism had a decided influence on the later Greek Church. A Council of Constantinople, in 920, discouraged second, imposed penance for third, and excommunication for fourth marriage. Such is the discipline of the modern Greek Church. At a second marriage the "benediction of the crowns" is omitted, and "propitiatory prayers" are said; and although some concessions have been made with regard to the former ceremony, Leo Allatius testifies that it was still omitted in some parts of the Greek Church as late as the seventeenth century. A fourth marriage is still absolutely prohibited.[1]

The Latin Church has always been milder and more consistent. Hermas (Lib. ii, Mand. iv. 4) emphatically maintains that there is no sin in second marriage. St. Ambrose ("De Viduis," c. 11) contents himself with saying: "We do not prohibit second marriages, but we do not approve marriages frequently reiterated." Jerome's words are: "I do not condemn those who marry twice, three times, nay, if such a thing can be said, eight times (*non damno digamos, imo et trigamos, et, si dici potest, octogamos*)"; but he shows his dislike for repeated marriage (Ep. lxvii, "Apol. pro libris adv. Jovin."). Gregory III advises Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, to prevent, if he can, people marrying more than twice, but he does not call such unions sinful. Nor did the Latin Church impose any penance for reiterated marriage. We do, indeed, find penance imposed on those who married again, in the penitential books of Theodore, who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 668. But Theodore's view came from his Greek nationality; and if Herardus, Archbishop of Tours, speaks of third marriage, etc., as "adultery," this is probably to be explained by the Greek influence which had spread from England to France. Anyhow, this is the earliest trace of such rigorism in the West.

[1] The Oriental sects (Copts, Jacobites, Armenians) are even stricter than the Greeks. The Nestorians, however, are, as might have been expected, free from any spirit of strictness on this point. (Denzinger, Rit. Orient., i. 180.)

The Latin Church, however, did exhibit one definite mark of disfavor for reiterated marriage. Decretals of Alexander III and Urban III forbid priests to give the nuptial benediction in such cases. Durandus (died 1296) speaks of the custom in his time as different in different places. The " Rituale Romanum " of Paul V (1605–1621) forbids the nuptial benediction, only tolerating the custom of giving it, when it already existed, if it was the man only who was being married again. The present Rubric permits the nuptial benediction except when the woman has been married before.

THE BANNS

Banns are the proclamation of intended marriage, in order that if any one is aware of an impediment, he may state it to the ecclesiastical authorities, and so prevent the celebration of the wedding. Such proclamations were introduced first of all by the custom of particular places, but it was not till 1215 that they were imposed, at the Fourth Lateran Council, by a general law binding the whole Church (Fleury, *Hist.*, LXXVII. 52). The Council of Trent (Sess. xxiv, can. 1) orders the banns to be proclaimed, by the parish priest of the persons who intend to marry, during Mass on three continuous festivals. At the same time, it permits the ordinary to dispense from the obligation of proclaiming the marriage, for a grave reason. According to theologians and the Sacred Congregation of the Council, the banns must be proclaimed in the parish church of the contracting parties, and in each parish church if they live in different parishes, at the principal Mass on three continuous Sundays or holydays of obligation—or at least on days when there is sure to be a concourse of people in the church. It is generally held that if the marriage does not take place within two months, or at most four, of the last publication, the banns must be proclaimed anew.

CEREMONIES OF MARRIAGE

From the earliest times, and in all times, Christians have been wont to celebrate their marriages in church, and to have them blessed by the priest; nor can they celebrate them otherwise without sin, except in case of necessity. "It is fitting," Ignatius writes ("Ad Polycarp." 5), "for men and women who marry to form this union with the approval of the bishop, that their union may be according to God." "What words can suffice," Tertullian says ("Ad Uxor.," ii. 9), "to tell the happiness of that marriage which the Church unites, the oblation confirms, and the blessing seals, the angels announce, the Father acknowledges!"

In the form approved for this country the priest, in surplice and white stole, questions the man and woman as to their consent. Then each party expresses this consent at length and in the vulgar tongue, with joined hands: "I, ——, take thee, ——, to my wedded wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death us do part, if Holy Church will it permit, and thereto I plight thee my troth." "I, ——, take thee, ——, to my wedded husband," etc. Whereupon the priest: "I join you into marriage in the name of the Father, and of the Son," etc. The bridegroom then places gold and silver on a plate or on the book, which he afterward gives to the bride, and a ring which the priest sprinkles with holy water and blesses. The bridegroom takes the ring from the priest and gives the money to his wife, saying, "With this ring I thee wed, this gold and silver I thee give, with this body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow"; then he puts the ring on the thumb of his wife's left hand, saying, "In the name of the Father"; on her second finger, saying, "and of the Son"; on her third finger, saying, "and of the Holy Ghost"; and on her fourth finger, where he leaves it, saying, "Amen." The Nuptial Mass is then celebrated, and the priest gives the nuptial benediction after the Paternoster and again after the "Ite Missa." Nothing

can exceed the grace and tender beauty of these prayers of benediction.

Many of these ceremonies belonged originally to the betrothal. The ring, or *annulus pronubus*, was used to plight troth before Christian time by the Romans. So again, espousing with gold and silver, called *arrhæ*, certainly existed among the Franks previous to their embracing Christianity, and also among the Jews, whence it may have passed into the Greek ritual. The joining of hands (once accompanied by a kiss) is alluded to by Tertullian ("De Virg. Veland.," 11). St. Isidore of Seville, quoted by Chardon, says the ring was put on the fourth finger of the left hand because it contains a vein immediately connected with the heart. This sage reason was the current one in the middle ages.

The words of the priest, "Ego jungo" ("I join you into marriage"), are of comparatively recent origin, as may be seen by looking through the extracts from ancient Sacramentaries and Missals published by Father Martene. They are omitted in a Pontifical of Sens 300 years old, and in the "Ordo ad faciendum sponsalia" from a Sarum "Manuale" of 1543. On the other hand, two striking ceremonies mentioned by Nicholas I in his answer to the Bulgarians, and both older than Christianity itself, are now unknown among us. These are the solemn veiling of the bride and the wearing of crowns by the married couple. The Greeks have kept this latter rite: indeed, "crowning" among them is a common word for the nuptial benediction. The marriage service according to the old English use of Sarum is substantially the same as the modern Roman, but more elaborate. The couple stood at the church door till the man had placed the ring on the woman's hand (the right hand, by the way), and certain prayers had been said over them. Additional prayers were said over them at the altar steps: then, before Mass began, they were placed in the presbytery—"that is to say, between the choir and the altar" (rubric of Sarum Manual). The rubric of the Hereford Missal directs them to hold lights in their hands. The Nuptial Mass was "of the Trinity," with prayers for the occasion. After the Sanctus, four clerics in sur-

plices held a veil (*pallium*) over them while they lay prostrate, and the special benediction was given after the Fraction of the Host. At the " Agnus Dei " the *pallium* was removed, both rose, and the bridegroom received the pax from the priest and kissed his wife. There is nothing in the Sarum Manual which answers to our nuptial prayer before the " Ite Missa est," though the Hereford Missal gives a special form of benediction with the chalice. After Mass, bread and wine, or some other liquor, were blessed and tasted by the newly married couple. At night the priest blessed the nuptial couch.

These rites occur almost exactly in the same order and form in a Ritual of Rennes and a Pontifical from the monastery of Leri. But we can find no parallel for the placing of the ring on the bride's right hand.

In the Greek Church the marriage service is known as *akolouthia tou stephanomatos*, the office of crowning. After the espousals, in which two rings, one of gold and another of silver, are placed on the altar and given by the priest to bridegroom and bride respectively, the persons to be married enter the church, preceded by the priest with the incense. After Psalm xxxi and various prayers, the priest puts a crown on the head of each, with the words, " The servant of God —— crowns the servant of God —— in the name," etc. There is no mention of Nuptial Mass in the modern Greek Euchologies, and Greeks are usually married in the evening. From more ancient manuscripts, however, Goar found that the bridegroom and bride used to receive communion from a particle of a Host previously consecrated and placed in a chalice with ordinary wine.

MIXED MARRIAGES

Mixed marriages are marriages between persons of different religions. A marriage between a baptized and an unbaptized person is invalid; one between a Catholic and a person of another communion—for example, a Protestant—is valid, but, unless a dispensation has been obtained from the Pope or his delegate, unlawful.

Here it will be useful to say something of the legislation of the Church on marriages between Catholics and other Christians not Catholics.

Benedict XIV (Instruction on Marriages in Holland, 1741: Encyclical, "Magnæ nobis") has declared the Church's vehement repugnance to such unions, on the ground that they are not likely to be harmonious, that they expose the Catholic party and the children to danger of perversion, that they are apt to produce indifference, etc.

He says the Church has permitted them for very grave reasons, and generally in the case of royal personages; but even then only on condition that the Catholic party be free to practise his or her religion, and that a promise be given that the children of either sex be brought up Catholics.

Increasing intercourse between Catholics and Protestants made such marriages more frequent, and the conditions insisted on by Benedict XIV were neglected. In Silesia a law of the state in 1803 required the children of mixed marriages to be brought up in the religion of the father. In England, till very recent times, there was a common arrangement by which the boys were brought up in the father's, the girls in the mother's religion; and neither in Silesia (see Hergenröther, "Kirchengeschichte," II. 856 *et seq.*) nor in England did the Catholic clergy, as a rule, oppose this state of things. An attempt was made by the Prussian Government in 1825 to introduce the law which prevailed in Silesia and the other Eastern provinces into the Rhineland and Westphalia; and this order of the Cabinet was accepted by Von Spiegel, Archbishop of Cologne, and also, though with some scruple, by the Bishops of Paderborn, Münster, and Treves. This led Pius VIII and Gregory XVI to declare a mixed marriage, when it was not understood that the children of either sex should be brought up Catholics, contrary to the "natural and divine law." Otherwise, the priest could take no part in the celebration. In extreme cases, and to avoid greater evils, he might passively assist at the contract; but more the Pope himself could not permit. Obedience to these Papal briefs led to the impris-

onment of Droste von Vischering, the new Archbishop of Cologne, in 1837, and to that of the Archbishop of Posen in 1839. But the bishops, even those who had once been of a different mind, steadfastly adhered to the Papal regulations. One exception, however, must be mentioned. The Prince-Bishop of Breslau resigned his see in 1840 rather than submit, and became a Protestant. He died in 1871. Under William IV peace was gradually restored between Church and state.

HOW TO COMPLY WITH THE NEW MARRIAGE LAW [1]

THE MARRIAGE LICENSE

It is necessary for all persons intending to be married to obtain a marriage license from the town or city clerk of the town or city in which the woman to be married resides, and to deliver this license to the priest who is to officiate, before the marriage ceremony can be performed. If the woman or both parties to be married are non-residents of the State, such license must be obtained from the clerk of the town or city in which the marriage is to be performed.

Both parties must present themselves before the town or city clerk to secure the license. A license issued to minors must bear the signatures of the parents or guardians.

FORM OF LICENSE

State of
County of
City or town of

Know all men by this certificate that any person authorized by law to perform marriage ceremonies within the State of to whom this may come, he, not knowing any lawful impediment thereto, is hereby authorized

[1] The valuable information presented under this heading has been obtained from Father J. F. Irwin and Father M. J. Biggane, of the parish of St. Cecilia, Brooklyn, to whom acknowledgment is here gratefully made.

and empowered to solemnize the rites of matrimony between [*Name of bridegroom.*] of in the county of and State of and [*Name of bride.*] of in the county of and State of and to certify the same to be said parties or either of them under his hand and seal in his ministerial or official capacity, and thereupon he is required to return his certificate in the form hereto annexed.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said town or city at this day of nineteen hundred and

[SEAL.] .....

FORM OF CERTIFICATE

THE certificate annexed to the marriage license and referred to therein is in form substantially as follows:

I, a residing at in the county of and State of , do hereby certify that I did on this day of nineteen hundred and , in the county of and State of , solemnize the rites of matrimony between [*Name of bridegroom.*] of in the county of and State of and [*Name of bride.*] of in the county of and State of , in the presence of and as witnesses, and the license therefor is hereto annexed.

Witness my hand at in the county of this day of nineteen hundred and

.....

In the presence of

.....

.....

The license and the certificate, signed by the priest who solemnized the marriage therein authorized, must be returned by him to the office of the town or city clerk who issued the same on or before the tenth day of the month next succeeding the date of the solemnization of the marriage.

STATEMENT TO BE FILLED OUT AND SIGNED BY EACH OF THE CONTRACTING PARTIES

It is the duty of the town or city clerk, when an application for a marriage license is made to him, to require each of the contracting parties to sign and verify a statement or affidavit before such clerk, or one of his deputies, containing the following information:

From the groom: Full name of husband, color, place of residence, age, occupation, place of birth, name of father, country of birth, maiden name of mother, country of birth, number of marriage.

From the bride: Full name of bride, place of residence, color, age, occupation, place of birth, name of father, country of birth, maiden name of mother, country of birth, number of marriage.

The town or city clerk must also embody in the statement or affidavit, if either or both of the applicants have been previously married, a statement as to whether the former husband or husbands or the former wife or wives of the respective applicants are living or dead, and must also embody therein a statement that no legal impediment exists as to the right of each of the applicants to enter into the marriage state.

THE RELIGIOUS CEREMONY

ALL arrangements for the marriage and the marriage ceremony pertain to the pastor in whose parish the prospective bride has lived for at least one month prior to the date set for the marriage.

The license secured, both parties should call, at least three weeks before the date set for the marriage, on the pastor, who will desire information on the following points: whether there exists any natural relationship, or relationship through marriage or sponsorship in the sacraments of baptism or confirmation, between the contracting parties; when and where each was baptized.

The banns must be published at least twice before the marriage can take place. Sometimes this publication is dispensed with, but only for weighty reasons. This is one of the means used by Holy Church to throw safeguards around the holy sacrament of Matrimony. The civil laws, which prescribe a license for marriage, attest the prudence of church laws that have been in existence for centuries.

If one of the contracting parties be a non-Catholic, that one must sign a paper in which the following promises are made:

(*a*) That the Catholic party will be permitted the full exercise of religion according to the Catholic faith.

(*b*) That all children of either sex, born of the marriage, will be baptized and educated in the faith and according to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, even if the Catholic party be taken away by death.

(*c*) That in the solemnization of the marriage there will be only the Catholic ceremony.

Since Matrimony is a sacrament of the living, and hence should be received only by those who are in the state of grace, the contracting parties should receive it only after having confessed and received holy communion.

NEW PAPAL DECREE

THE new papal decree on marriage makes it advisable for Catholics to know the following regulations:

1. A marriage of Catholics contracted before any official other than a duly delegated Catholic priest and two witnesses is null and void. Hence marriages contracted subsequent to April 18, 1908, before aldermen, judges, or other merely civil officials, or non-Catholic ministers, are null and void.

2. A marriage contracted by a baptized Catholic with a non-baptized person is null and void, unless a dispensation be secured from ecclesiastical authority expressly to remove this impediment.

There are ecclesiastical impediments which, unless removed by dispensation, render a marriage illicit but not invalid; and others, some of which spring from the natural law, which render a marriage null, unless a dispensation intervene, where such is possible. Some of those which render a marriage illicit but not null are:

1. The forbidden times—that is, from the first Sunday of Advent to the feast of the Epiphany, inclusive, and from Ash Wednesday to the octave of Easter, inclusive. During this time only the solemnities of marriage are forbidden—namely, the nuptial mass and solemn blessing of the marriage.

2. A previous engagement of marriage with another person, if not legitimately broken.

3. A simple vow of chastity, of not contracting marriage, of entering a religious order, of receiving sacred orders, or of virginity.

4. Diversity of religion—i.e., in the case of a baptized Catholic and a baptized person of a non-Catholic sect.

The more frequently occurring impediments which render a marriage null and void unless removed by dispensation, where such is possible, are:

1. Natural, spiritual, or legal relationship between the contracting parties. *Natural* relationship in this matter is that which exists between relatives to the fourth degree inclusive. *Spiritual*

relationship in this matter is that which exists between a person who baptizes another, the person baptized, and his or her parents. Hence the sponsors of a person in baptism cannot validly, without dispensation, marry the person baptized, or either of the parents. Likewise the sponsors of a person in confirmation cannot, without dispensation, validly marry the person for whom they are sponsors, or either of that person's parents. No relationship is contracted by sponsors with each other from the mere fact that they are sponsors. *Legal* relationship is that which arises from adoption, when executed with certain legal formalities.

2. Affinity, to the fourth degree inclusive, existing between a married person and the blood relatives of the partner.

3. Public decorum, which exists between a person validly engaged and the relatives, to the second degree, of the person with whom the engagement to marry was made.

4. Difference of religion, which impediment exists between a validly baptized person and those who are not baptized.

These are the more frequently occurring impediments which render a marriage null unless they be removed by dispensation ; the others can be discovered best by the priest with whom the arrangements for marriage are made.

SACRED DIGNITY OF MARRIAGE

One can hardly speak too forcibly of the necessity of appreciating the sacred dignity of marriage. Raised by Jesus Christ from the rank of a contract to the dignity of a sacrament, this sacred bond is frequently denied the respect accorded to every-day business dealings. Many who approach a business contract only after careful preparation and sometimes legal consultation, rush into marriage with a nonchalance and precipitancy that bespeak a failure to appreciate that marriage is a contract in which lives and souls are concerned, and not merely gold which cannot buy happiness or salvation. Careful preparation for marriage is essential to marriage happiness. Many whose lives were wrecked by a misalliance in

marriage did their serious thinking only when it was too late. Beauty and physical grace, unaccompanied by compatible traits of character, cannot give assurance of lasting happiness in the marriage state. Let care be exercised in the selection of a life partner, let well-ordered courtship nourish pure love, let prayer and the grace of the sacraments safeguard the souls that are to seek salvation together, let the blessing of Mother Church consecrate the union, and the divorce court will not be made the sorrowful scene of a Catholic petitioning the rupture of a home and the separation of those whom God has joined together.